FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 158

17 August 1981

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/SALT/MBFR

Haig Comments Show Lack of Interest in Talks AA 1
'Weinberger Plan' for Nuclear Forces Rapped AA 1
Diego Garcia Becoming Springboard for Aggression [L. Ponomarev] AA 2
Disarmament Agency Report on Nuclear War Assailed [Knyazkov] AA 3
Krasikov Examines Disarmament Issues, Questions AA 3
Committee for European Security Raps Neutron Bomb AA 5

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers' Roundtable' CC 1
[Zhurkin, Bogdanov, Levin]
Need for Peace in Asia CC 1
Space Treaty Proposal CC 1
Bomb Decision, Euromissiles CC 2
'International Situation--Questions and Answers' CC 6
[Basev, Anichkin, Senenov]
Reagan Decision on Bomb CC 6
Role of NSA CC 9
UN Reaction to Space Treaty Proposal Viewed CC 9
PRAVDA Assesses Work of Madrid CSCE Meeting [Chernyshev, 6 Aug] CC 10

NORTHEAST ASIA

CPSU Sends Critical Letter to Japanese Communists C 1
Part I C 1
Part II C 4
Report, Commentary on DPRK Liberation Day C 7
Moscow Meeting Held C 7
Korolev Comment C 8
Mikhaylov on Soviet Aid C 9

SOUTH ASIA

NOVOYE VREMYA Views Iran Presidential Election D 1
[Mezentsev, No 32]
Situation in Herat Viewed; Interference Scored D 2
Ponomarev Commentary D 2
India's Reddy Sends In-Flight Message to Brezhnev [PRAVDA 2 Aug] D 3

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Commentary on Indonesian Independence Day E 1
Gromyko Congratulates Malaysian Counterpart E 2
[Pshenkin in IZVESTIYA 6 Aug]
Lao Prime Minister Arrives in Soviet Union E 2
Kalinin Reports on USSR Imports of Thai Rice E 2
[PRAVDA 31 Jul]
Briefs: SRV Water Delegation E 2

EASTERN EUROPE

Communique, Report on Soviet-Polish Talks F 1
Communique Issued F 1
Kania, Jaruzelski Depart F 3
Commentator Views Berlin Wall Anniversary F 3
Aliyev Receives Hungarian Farming Combine Chief F 4
[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 28 Jul]

WESTERN EUROPE

Trade With West Europe Based on Political Realism G 1
FRG Journal Cited on USSR-FRG Economic Links [Sosnovsky] G 1

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Skachkov Meets With Nigerian Steel Minister J 1
[IZVESTIYA 31 Jul]
Guinea Party Delegation Arrives for USSR Visit J 1
[IZVESTIYA 4 Aug]
Guinea Republic Ambassador Presents Credentials [PRAVDA 7 Aug] J 1
Cooperation Protocol Signed With Madagascar J 1
[IZVESTIYA 31 Jul]

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

CPSU Adopts Decision on Monitoring Performance R 1
Petroleum Minister Maltsev Visits Azerbaijan R 1
[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 30 Jul]
Report on Armenian Central Committee Plenum R 2
[Yerevan KOMMUNIST 25 Jul]
Demirchyan Address [Yerevan KOMMUNIST 25 Jul] R 3
Lawyer Offers Advice to Political Trial Witnesses R 3
[Vernet in Paris LE MONDE 6 Aug]
Briefs: Education in Kirgiz SSR R 4

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Radov Series on Shchekino Labor-Sharing Experiment S 1
Part II [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Jul] S 1
Series Ends [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Jul] S 5
Dolgikh Addresses Gas Industry Conference S 8
Briefs: Oil Extraction S 8

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

RSFSR CSA Official Reports Harvesting Statistics T 1
Radio Reports Agricultural Developments 14-16 Aug T 1
Fodder Procurement Totals for Early August T 2
[Glinka in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 7 Aug]
Pavlov Reviews Harvesting of Grain, Fodder T 4
[IZVESTIYA 6 Aug]
Briefs: Kazakh Corn Harvest T 6

HAIG COMMENTS SHOW LACK OF INTEREST IN TALKS

LD152140 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1527 GMT 15 Aug 81

[Excerpt] Washington, 15 Aug (TASS)--The Reagan administration shows no interest in starting a serious dialogue with the USSR with the aim of establishing control over nuclear arms, making the unbridled stepping up of U.S. military might its keystone. This is testified to by the utterances of representatives of the American Government, in particular Secretary of State Haig.

In an interview with ABC, Haig directly and categorically rejected the possibility of a "peaceful offensive on the part of United States" and justified the course taken by the administration toward stepping up the arms race and toward confrontation with the Soviet Union.

In this connection, Haig resorted to the stereotyped selection of assertions which were directed toward distorting the essence of Soviet foreign policy. In particular, he made an unsubstantiated allegation of a certain "interference" in regional conflicts by the USSR.

The secretary of state confirmed that the United States "had begun the production of neutron bomb components some time ago." Haig was forced to state that the powerful anti-war movement in West Europe had markedly intensified regarding the plans of the American military in connection with neutron weapons. However, with typically imperial disdain and arrogance, he stated that Washington pays no attention to criticism of the administration on the part of the West Europeans.

The statement by retired Gen E. Rowney at the ceremony for his instatement as the new head of the U.S. delegation at the arms control and disarmament talks reflected the position of the White House on the question of talks with the Soviet Union. He came out in favor of "restoring" the might of the American Armed Forces.

'WEINBERGER PLAN' FOR NUCLEAR FORCES RAPPED

LD161700 Moscow TASS in English 1620 GMT 16 Aug 81

[Text] New York, 16 Aug, TASS--The AP agency reported that President Ronald Reagan intends to break his vacation and hold in Los Angeles, California, a meeting with U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig, Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger and high-ranking advisers on national security affairs. They are to discuss ways of building up the nuclear potential of the United States, chiefly the comprehensive plan, which was drawn up by the Pentagon chief, for modernising and expanding the country's strategic nuclear force. The plan is aimed, as the newspaper New York TIMES pointed out quoting a high-ranking spokesman for the administration, at ensuring the supremacy of the United States over the Soviet Union in the field of nuclear weapons.

The Weinberger plan provides, in particular, for a permanent presence in the air over various areas of the world of nearly 100 special aircraft with intercontinental ballistic MX missiles on board. The deployment of MX missiles is an addition to rather than replacement of the already available intercontinental Minutemen and Titan missiles.

The Pentagon chief also advocates the speediest creation of a modernized version of the strategic B-1 bomber. In so doing, he makes it clear that work will be simultaneously done to design a fundamentally new aircraft of the class that would be practically "invisible" to radars. If the new bomber proves to be more effective than the modernised B-1 the latter will not be "written off" but, as the newspaper points out, turned into a carrier of air-based cruise missiles.

The Weinberger plan also provides for an all-round buildup of the U.S. naval might. As the New York TIMES reports, it is planned to launch at an accelerated rate nuclear-powered "Trident submarines" with 24 ballistic missiles on board. One such submarine is to be launched every year in the course of the next three years and then three submarines--every two years.

According to the newspaper, considerable attention is also devoted to modernizing the whole system of communication and control of the U.S. strategic force. Vast sums are to be spent on perfecting reconnaissance satellites, ground radar stations, command posts etc. Apart from it, it is planned to deploy on secret bases on Earth "reserve" spy satellites, which can be launched into a near-Earth orbit any time. On the whole, the New York TIMES stresses, there has never been such a large-scale and expensive military program in the history of the United States.

It becomes absolutely clear in the light of such plans that the claims by spokesmen for the U.S. administration about the necessity to make up for some alleged "lag" from the USSR in the military field, are thoroughly hypocritical and are made only with purely propaganda aims. The examination of the Weiberger plan in Los Angeles, as the AP agency frankly admits, will mark the start of a broad discussion by the administration of ways for the attainment of nuclear supremacy over the Soviet Union.

DIEGO GARCIA BECOMING SPRINGBOARD FOR AGGRESSION

LD142254 Moscow TASS in English 1955 GMT 14 Aug 81

[TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev: "Bases for Neutron Weapons"]

[Text] Moscow, 14 Aug, TASS--The British Government has agreed with the Pentagon's plans to adopt the Diego Garcia Island, in the Indian Ocean, on which the United States has a military base, to receive and service American strategic B-52 bombers which can carry nuclear weapons aboard. According to a spokesman of the British Defence Ministry, these bombers, and also heavy military-transport planes, to carry weapons and combat equipment for the Rapid Deployment Force, will be based on the island allegedly only at a time of "crisis situations". The London representative preferred to keep silent on whether or not it is planned to deploy American nuclear weapons on Diego Garcia.

It is however known that the American (?base) on Diego Garcia has already been adapted for entry of U.S. combat ships, fitted out with nuclear weapons. And now the run-way and auxiliary services are being adapted for B-52 planes, which carry nuclear bombs and missiles. Thus, Diego Garcia is being turned into a springboard of American nuclear aggression directed primarily against the countries and peoples of the region.

Washington's aggressive preparations are being carried out within the framework of a special five-year plan of construction or expansion of military bases in the Middle East and the Indian Ocean. Leaders of the U.S. administration openly declare the intention to resort in their policy to the threat of use or use of force, including the use of nuclear weapons to further their aims. A special subversive-interventionist Rapid Deployment Force is being formed exactly for this purpose. Bases are being urgently looked for these forces in different parts of the world. Depots of such weapons and of Diego Garcia equipment, enough to arm 12-15 thousand men, are deployed on seven American warships turned into floating bases.

Such ivity of the United States assumes a particularly sinister character in connection with decision of President Reagan to start full-scale production of neutron weapons--the m barbarous means of mass destruction of people. The Pentagon command does not conceal plans of equipping all American troops, stationed outside the United States, with neutron weapons.

Washington's assertions that development of the neutron weapon is alledgedly a "purely internal matter" are a gross deception of the world public.

The neutron weapon is a means of mass extermination of people and all living. There is no doubt that the U.S. leaders are not going to destroy anybody on their own territory. They plan to use this barbarous weapon on the territory of other countries, against other peoples. No matter what subterfuges representatives of the U.S. administration resort to, the neutron weapon is the weapon of aggression, the weapon of those who intend to dictate their will to the whole world. The turning of Diego Garcia into a nuclear springboard of American strategy is a demonstrative challenge to the countries of the Pacific Ocean basin which are striving to turn the Indian Ocean into a peace zone through collective efforts.

DISARMAMENT AGENCY REPORT ON NUCLEAR WAR ASSAILED

LD141606 Moscow TASS in English 1500 GMT 14 Aug 81

[TASS commentator Maksim Knyazkov: "By Logic of Nuclear Insanity"]

[Text] Moscow, 14 Aug, TASS--It seems Washington is truly in the grips of nuclear fever. Hardly had the ink dried on the presidential decree about launching of the full-scale production of neutron weapons than further convincing evidence appeared that the U.S. administration is preparing for atomic war. The well-known observer of the newspaper "Washington POST" Jack Anderson came into possession of a secret report of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency whose authors are analysing the consequences that nuclear conflict would have for the United States.

These consequences are horrifying indeed. From 80 to 150 million Americans will be killed, and these awesome figures are based on the assumption that the United States population will have enough advance knowledge about the atomic holocaust. Otherwise the toll will be even greater.

One is staggered not so much by these horrible figures. They were not even mentioned in the report. Jack Anderson himself arrived at them on the basis of the document.

The authors of the secret report have done all they could to present the consequences of nuclear war in a milder way. They are even trying to "reassure" the U.S. leadership by stating that up to 65 percent of Americans might survive world war. They do not forget to mention the need of observing certain protective measures that would lessen the losses etc. It is not accidental that Jack Anderson had to note in his commentary to the report that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is trying to accentuate the positive, in other words, the report places the emphasis on what will remain intact and not on what will be destroyed.

Thus, it is sought cynically in the United States to try to create the impression that nuclear war will not be so horrible, and hence, is acceptable. As they say: Blessed is he who believes. It only remains to note that Carter's suicidal idea of a "permissibility of a limited nuclear conflict" apparently suits the new Washington authorities. The U.S. administration is concerned not with the preservation of peace, if only for the sake of the lives of their compatriots, but with spiralling the arms race, including nuclear arms, to establish the United States' hegemony over the world. It is highly symbolic that members of the staff of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency are now being instructed not to perform their direct duties but estimate the number of potential victims of Washington's adventuristic militaristic policy.

KRASIKOV EXAMINES DISARMAMENT ISSUES, QUESTIONS

LD160820 Moscow TASS in English 0714 GMT 16 Aug 81

[TASS news analyst Anatoliy Krasikov: "War or Peace"]

[Text] Moscow, 16 Aug, TASS--The time has come when the West as a whole and each capitalist state individually should give a direct and clear-cut answer on which the destiny of their relations with socialist countries, and in a broader sense--the destiny of mankind depend.

The question is very simple: What do present-day Western leaders want: detente or intensified arms race, to reduce the level of military confrontation or accelerate and expand the arms race?

Until now, despite all difficulties and complications which appeared along the lines of rapprochement and cooperation of the countries with different social systems, it seemed that the West has chosen the first from the two possible alternatives. But at some point the situation changed. In any case, official Washington, which sets the fashion in the capitalist camp, ever more clearly assumes a course towards war.

Each responsible person, no matter where he lives, should realize that, although the USSR and other socialist countries do not want conflicts, they cannot be responsible for the actions of nuclear maniacs overseas. And if those start a nuclear missile war, the entire arsenal of weapons, stockpiled in the past years, will be put to use with all ensuing consequences.

U.S. officials (and some people in Western Europe who echo them) are trying to prove that the "main purpose of Moscow" is to "split" the ranks of Western allies in order to subjugate them to itself one after another, and that the refusal of this or that state to accede to the Pentagon's plans would mean to recognize that the Soviet Union has some "right to veto" on NATO decisions.

Let us make it plain: If Mrs Thatcher or Mr Lagorio would like to express their loyalty to the overseas leader on every occasion (and without occasion for that matter) it is their business after all. Likewise, if Mr Reagan is fond of taking decisions, likely to influence the entire Western alliance without consultations with his allies, moreover, treating them as vassals, that is entirely up to him. This is no concern of either the Soviet Union or its friends and allies.

But only a hopelessly narrow-minded person or a deliberate provocateur can preach the idea that any appeal for peace and arms reduction, as long as it came from Moscow, should be automatically rejected in the name of the West's unity, and that it is better to die all together, than to try, either individually or collectively, to make a concrete positive contribution to the cause of averting the irreparable.

It is equally absurd to see behind the wide scope of struggle in Europe in protest against U.S. military plans results of the propaganda campaign orchestrated by Moscow. Those who assert such things consider their own peoples to be feeble-minded--their peoples who to a no lesser degree than the peoples of the USSR and other socialist countries, want peace, and not collective suicide.

President Reagan's adviser Edwin Meese and some other proponents of the arms race look like newcomers from another planet when they assert that the deployment in Europe of additional vehicles of delivery of U.S. nuclear weapons and the production of the neutron bomb will allegedly impel the USSR to negotiations.

There is no need to impel the USSR to negotiations, in the first place. The Soviet Union has long demanded such negotiations and has said more than once that it is ready to start them immediately. And if someone does need to be impelled to negotiations, it is the United States. For, although Reagan, taking public sentiment into consideration, recently said that he agreed to negotiations in principle, in actual fact he puts them off for more or less indefinite future, and in the meantime shows activity in the opposite field--in the field of re-armament.

Secondly, one should realize that as new types and modifications of weapons are coming into being it is becoming increasingly difficult to find a common denominator for defining the equilibrium of forces, and to verify arms limitation.

Thirdly, if Mr Reagan and likeminded persons had really wanted to limit armaments (belonging not only to other nations, but their own too), he would have long ago responded to the proposals made, instead of assuming a course at achieving military superiority of the United States, strengthening first-strike capability and lowering the threshold of a nuclear war.

That is why a watershed between two courses in international politics should not pass along geographical and ideological frontiers. Given all the differences in world outlook and social standing all those who treasure life on earth should be on the same side of the barricade. And then the forces of destruction will find themselves in isolation.

COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN SECURITY RAPS NEUTRON BOMB

LD141624 Moscow TASS in English 1548 GMT 14 Aug 81

[Text] Moscow, 14 Aug, TASS--"It is with deep indignation that the Soviet public, which comes out for a Europe of peace, security and cooperation, learned about U.S President Reagan's order to unfurl the production of neutron weapons", it is said in a statement circulated here by the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation.

"One cannot but see", the statement says, "that by this decision, which is cynical in respect of the will and interests of the peoples of the world, the U.S. Government is creating a new, especially barbarous means of the mass annihilation of people".

"President Reagan's decision is a threat first of all to Europe, to the European peoples, just as to other regions which Washington might take into its head to declare a sphere of vital U.S. interests. The Pentagon is openly stating that Europe is the most probable area of military operations where the neutron weapons can be used".

"Reagan's decision is a new blow at detente, the cause of peace and security of the European peoples", it is stressed in the Soviet committee's statement. "Since the militarists are advertising in every way the possibility of using neutron weapons in a so called limited nuclear war, their deployment sharply increases the danger of thermo-nuclear catastrophe, spirals the arms race and inflicts irreparable damage to talks on arms reduction in Europe".

The Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation warmly supported the demands of the peoples for the renunciation of the neutron bomb and the mass actions by the West European public against this inhuman weapon. The Soviet public, the statement says, firmly supports the position of the Soviet Government, which stands for the prohibition of the neutron bomb, and its proposal to the West to reach agreement on the mutual renunciation of the production of neutron weapons.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS' ROUNDTABLE'

LD161754 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0845 GMT 16 Aug 81

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Vitaliy Vladimirovich Zhurkin, doctor of historical science; Radomir Georgiyevich Bogdanov, candidate of historical science; and Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, all-union radio commentator--only Levin's voice identifiable]

[Text] [Levin] Hello, esteemed comrade listeners. As you know, the friendly meetings between Leonid Ilich Brezhnev and leaders of fraternal parties and states are continuing in the Crimea. In particular, a meeting took place this week between Leonid Ilich Brezhnev and Yumjaagiyn Tsedenbal. It is natural that, when international questions were being discussed, particular attention was devoted at that meeting to the situation in Asia. This is explained by the fact that the political weight of Asia and its role in international affairs are growing. The Soviet Union and the Mongolian People's Republic consider this to be quite natural. They are convinced that Asian states are capable of contributing effectively to a general improvement of the international climate and the policy of India was mentioned first and foremost as an example of this active, positive influence of Asian states on the international situation.

Need for Peace in Asia

In this connection I should like to refer to the events linked with the 10th anniversary of the treaty of peace, friendship, and cooperation between the Soviet Union and India. This treaty is an important factor of peace and stability in Asia and throughout the world. It may be stated with full justification that its importance is increasing every year and the treaty assumes special significance in the complex situation taking shape in Asia.

The situation is a truly complex one and the reasons for this are China's hegemonistic ambitions. This past week there took place the visit by Chinese Premier Zhao Ziyang to Malaysia, the Philippines and Singapore. Then he made a brief stopover in Thailand. The discussions generally touched on various topics, but the main objective of the Chinese premier's visit was to whip up anti-Soviet and anti-Vietnamese moods.

[Speaker A] One's attention is drawn to the fact that a UPI correspondent called the Chinese premier's tour of Southeast Asian countries a crusade against the Soviet Union and Vietnam.

[Levin] Yes, and of course in these conditions the proposals advanced at the 18th Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Congress for concluding an agreement on mutual nonaggression and rejection of the use of force in relations between the states of Asia and the Pacific Ocean acquire special significance.

During this discussion with Comrade Tsedenbal, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev supported Mongolia's important initiative.

[Speaker B] As the report on the meeting between Comrades Brezhnev and Tsedenbal notes, concern for peace is the chief concern of peoples in all continents. Our country, implementing the peace program for the eighties drawn up by the 26th party congress, is systematically pursuing a policy of strengthening peace. A new, concrete example of this is the proposal to include on the agenda of the 36th Session of the UN General Assembly, which begins in New York in just over 1 month, the question of concluding a treaty on banning the stationing of weapons of any kind in space.

Space Treaty Proposal

[Levin] One may, and possibly one should, recall that right at the beginning of the space age, in 1958, the Soviet Union put forward a proposal at the United Nations which provided for a ban on the use of space for military purposes. Over all the years that followed our country has invariably supported, and supports, the idea that space should be a field of exclusively peaceful collaboration.

One may note with satisfaction that not a little has already been accomplished in this direction. Thus, in 1963, an international treaty was concluded on banning nuclear weapons testing in the atmosphere, space and under water. The 1967 treaty on the principles governing the activity of states in the research and utilization of space, including the Moon and other heavenly bodies, provides that the Moon and other heavenly bodies be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and also bans the launching into orbit around the Earth and stationing in space in any other manner of any objects carrying nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction. The 1979 agreement on activity by states on the Moon and other heavenly bodies develops and makes more specific the obligations of states to ensure the exclusively peaceful use of the Moon and other heavenly bodies of the solar system.

This agreement is important and these treaties are important, but unfortunately all the international documents I have enumerated do not rule out the possibility of stationing in space those types of weapons which do not fall under the definition of weapons of mass destruction. As a result, the danger of a militarization of space remains and has recently been growing.

[Speaker B] I should like to say that, both in the United States of America and in West Europe, the rapture which this spring greeted the first flight of the Columbia reusable spaceship has become somewhat subdued and increasing anxiety is being expressed that the Pentagon has entered this space program on a grand scale and is squeezing out all the departments which are using this space program for peace purposes. There is increasing talk of using the reusable spaceship for military purposes, primarily for installing on it various types of laser weapons in the long term--laser weapons which can be used against the satellites of another country, possibly against the missiles of another country.

Yes, if one wishes one can always find a military application for lasers. Their use against satellites is especially dangerous because if one side carries out a strike against the satellites of the other side, that side may rightly take this as a clear and precise signal that the other side is preparing to make a sudden attack against it. The launching of laser weapons into space will, I think, have a colossal destabilizing influence. They understand this perfectly well in the United States and many are discussing this fairly frankly.

[Levin] In order that space should always remain pure and free from weapons of any kind, in order that it should not become a new arena for the arms race and a source of exacerbation of relations between states, the Soviet Union proposes the conclusion of an international treaty on banning the stationing of weapons of any kind in space. Incidentally, and today this is particularly to the point, the Soviet Union has frequently proposed that agreement should also be reached on mutual renunciation of the production of neutron weapons and that such weapons should be banned. A specific draft international convention put forward by the socialist countries is lying on the conference table at the Disarmament Committee in Geneva.

Bomb Decision, Euromissiles

[Speaker B] Yet in reply to this the United States makes a decision on the deployment of the neutron bomb and on the stockpiling of this monstrous weapon of mass destruction and, just as if he were thumbing his nose at all peoples, President Reagan made this decision on 6 August, that is, exactly 36 years after the barbarous American atomic bombing of Hiroshima.

[Levin] Of course, for this reason the TASS statement quite justifiably describes this step of the U.S. administration as yet another striking example of an approach to international affairs that is fraught with extremely dangerous consequences.

[Speaker B] It seems to me that it is worth reminding our listeners what the neutron bomb is.

Well, with the ordinary nuclear bomb, the nuclear shell, or the nuclear warhead of a missile, its destructive action is manifested in four ways: a blast wave, a thermal wave, penetrating radition which acts instantaneously and the so-called residual radiation or radioactive fallout.

A characteristic of the neutron bomb is that it produces particularly intense penetrating radiation--approximately five or six times more than the ordinary atomic bomb--and thus this bomb affects people especially barbarically. Well, every nuclear weapon is barbaric--that is recognized by all peoples--but even so, among the existing types some stand out as being particularly inhuman, as causing a particularly painful death, and among these is the neutron bomb.

Over the past 100 years or so attempts have frequently been made to ban particularly barbaric types of weapons and among the various types of nuclear weapons, neutron weapons are especially savage and especially dangerous.

But it is not only a question of that. There is also the fact that the neutron weapon, when used, kills people while leaving various structures, such as defense structures, road installations, houses and so forth to a large extent intact. It must therefore evidently be regarded above all as an offensive weapon--one that will be used by an aggressor in order to advance faster and more successfully through the territory of the country on which he has launched an attack. Another thing that has to be taken into account is that with the neutron bomb, residual radiation is relatively small so that territory that has been bombarded with neutron warheads is easier to take over and occupy.

The Americans say they are going to arm themselves with neutron weapons with a view to using them in Europe against Soviet tanks. Yet it is well known that NATO today has about 300,000 highly accurate antitank devices with which the probability of a hit is, according to official U.S. figures, 90 percent. So, in other words, these weapons could hit about 250,000 tanks. But the total number of tanks in the world today is, according to UN statistics, 124,000. So each of these tanks could be hit twice. Therefore we cannot accept that argument. The fact that this is not a defensive but an offensive weapon is something that the U.S. propaganda services have so far failed to refute.

There are other important dangerous aspects of neutron weapons that we have to bear in mind. One is that this is a weapon of comparatively low power. This means that in an acute crisis, the U.S. commanders who will have the neutron weapon at their disposal may decide to use it--and may even use it more readily than they would make the decision to use conventional atomic bombs.

[Speaker A] U.S. television recently showed a serial about the Soviet military threat--in quotes, of course--and military preparations. That serial, which was viewed by millions of Americans, touched on this very question: Who has the right, under the existing structure of the U.S. Armed Forces, to use tactical nuclear weapons? If the neutron bomb is classed as a tactical nuclear weapon, then the question arises, concretely: Who has the right? It was stated in the commentary to this series of programs that, under the U.S. system, according to U.S. regulations, divisional commanders can use tactical nuclear weapons.

[Levin] In other words, the nuclear threshold is being lowered. This is organically connected, no doubt, with the well-known U.S. Presidential Directive 59 on limited nuclear war--on the possibility of limited nuclear war.

[Speaker B] Undoubtedly, these are all decisions of the same order--links, as it were, in a fairly complex mechanism, in which everything is included. The mechanism envisages the use, in certain emergency situations, of selective strikes by U.S. strategic forces. It also includes the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe. One of the elements of this mechanism--a highly dangerous and extremely alarming element--is the decision regarding the neutron bomb.

[Speaker A] I think you are quite right in seeing a connection between the notorious Presidential Directive 59 and the U.S. decision--the latest one--to produce the neutron bomb, because the neutron bomb, as a weapon, fits perfectly into the philosophy of Directive 59.

[Levin] That means that the U.S. plans and projects for a so-called limited nuclear war are taking an increasingly concrete shape. Naturally, those plans cannot fail to evoke the appropriate reaction throughout the world.

We are now confronted with what I think is a very indicative reaction, above all in West Europe: Even the allies of the United States are alarmed. Consider these facts: The Norwegian Government has issued an official protest over President Reagan's decision. Denmark, its Foreign Minister Olesen has said, also resolutely condemns President Reagan's decision. In West Germany, the government is said to have reacted without rapture. That is putting it mildly. Actually, the FRG Government is clearly worried.

There is another aspect. The talks that have been repeatedly spoken of between the Soviet Union and the United States on arms limitation are now once again being put off, though here there is a general tendency clearly discernible in the United States to conduct those talks from positions of strength.

[Speaker A] The question arises: What sort of rationality is the Reagan administration actually guided by in deciding to produce neutron weapons precisely on 6 August? On this point, we have the very interesting testimony of the well-known U.S. politician and journalist, Leslie Gelb. Leslie Gelb is well-known throughout the world as a major specialist and authority on problems of disarmament and arms control. He occupied a respectable post in the State Department in the Carter administration where he was concerned with these problems. On 9 August, he published a long article in the New York TIMES in which he told how the decision to produce neutron weapons was taken. What stands out in that article is, first of all, the attitude of the United States toward its allies. The article said bluntly that Weinberger and President Reagan, who made the final decision, said: We can no longer allow the rearming of America to depend upon the likes and dislikes of our allies. What was meant was that the U.S. must act as it sees fit in its national interests, without taking the interests of its allies into account. There are other points. Incidentally, Leslie Gelb notes that he is quite willing to believe that Weinberger, in insisting that the decision to produce neutron weapons be made at that particular moment, was applying a kind of sanction against the FRG Government, which is also being refractory as regards the further buildup of military expenditure.

[Speaker B] I think that all this emphasizes yet again all the ambiguity and awkwardness of the positons of the statesmen and military figures in West Europe who are now trying to somehow belittle, play down or camouflage the dangerous nature of this decision, trying to give the United States a hand, as it were, in their attempts to quell the wave of public indignation that has indeed now swept through the countries of Europe.

[Speaker A] But, you know the trouble is also that in Europe at present there is an exceedingly dangerous process going on of one problem being piled up on another. Still unsolved is the extremely acute problem of medium-range arms or medium-range missiles--the problem of the deployment in Europe of the U.S. Pershing missiles and cruise missiles. Around this problem, a very bitter struggle and controversy has flared up in Europe as the European public begins to realize more and more the lethal danger that those missiles bring with them. This is not without reason, since geographically a situation has been created in which there is not a single populated point in West Europe that would not be in a nuclear target zone.

Another thing is now being recalled in Europe: A few years ago an exercise was carried out on the territory of West Germany involving just one army corps. In the course of that exercise, tactical nuclear weapons were used. Well, of course, they were used in the plans, not in practice. The exercise took place on territory of only 10,000 square miles. When tactical nuclear weapons were used there theoretically, and calculations made, it emerged that as a result of limited use on limited territory, 1.5 million citizens of the FRG were theoretically killed and 3.8 million received burns and other severe injuries.

For this reason, the problem of medium-range missiles is compounded by this added problem of the neutron weapon which, as is quite evident to everybody, is above all of an offensive character which lowers the threshold and brings the probability of nuclear war nearer and increases this mortal danger which has loomed over West Europe.

[Levin] I should like in this connection to quote the Spanish newspaper ABC. The paper, overall, does not adopt a stand of sharp condemnation of the U.S. concept, and to a certain extent is even prepared to admit a certain validity to the U.S. President's line of reasoning.

But at the same time, ABC writes as follows: "The Reagan decision may be a fruit of realism but at any event it is the realism of the jungle, an inhuman and inhumane realism. The ability to kill deliberately and insidiously is no progress at all in the skill of killing.

[Speaker A] I would like to return to what I was saying earlier. Why was the decision made on 6 August? Well, the story is emerging--and it seems plausible--that the U.S. president was leaving on 6 August for a 1-month vacation and the decision had to be made on the eve of his departure. Without taking into account the fact that it was the anniversary of Hiroshima! Altogether, this is scandalous cynicism on the part of U.S. policy.

[Levin] In this connection I would like to bring to our listeners' attention to the recent speech by Haig, U.S. secretary of state, in New Orleans. As is well-known, certain attempts were made in this speech to make constructive proposals regarding talks with the Soviet Union. A very large number of different facts were piled together. As before, we were rebuked for the fact that the Soviet Union allegedly fails to show restraint although, and incidentally this must always be remembered, in the postwar period alone, according to the Brookings Institution, the United States has used armed force or the threat of the use of force toward other states and peoples on at least 215 occasions.

[Speaker B] If we look not at the whole of the postwar period, but at the last 6 months, and at the period of activity of the Reagan adminstration, a whole series of military and military-political decisions have been adopted which are directly aimed at enhancing the U.S. capacity for interventionism, for conducting local conflicts and, what is more, local conflicts not just with conventional armed forces.

[Speaker A] I would also add to that the fact that on the one hand they say and assert that they are prepared to hold talks, but on the other hand they are building up, in fact, and strengthening and modernizing those types of armed forces which are designed for waging war, and not just for waging war. What is taking place today, particularly in the field of the United States' nuclear strategy, testifies to the fact that that country is not only preparing to wage war but is preparing to win that war.

[Levin] When we say the United States has taken a steep course toward the buildup of military preparations, a natural question arises: How can this be explained and, in the end, where do the resources come from?

[Speaker A] You know, as far as the resources are concerned--I would like to start from this, from this aspect of your question--if you peel away the verbiage, if you get rid of all the propaganda heat, so to speak, which accompanies the so-called Reagan economic program, then the resources for arms, for the arms race, are drawn from two sources. Above all, social programs are being cut. It suffices to say that about $40 billion have been cut in social programs for this year....This affects medical services, unemployment benefits, the aged and children who have school lunches. In a word, it has above all hit the least well-off sections of U.S. society. Where have these cuts gone? They have been used to boost the military budget.

There is also another side to this program. Taxes are being cut and, moreover, a very broad propaganda campaign is taking place around this. Taxes are being cut by 25 percent. If you pick up a pencil and if you have any economic education at all, then you will easily work out that out of this 25-percent cut, 72 percent goes to the richest and most well-off sections of U.S. society. They get the benefit: Their taxes are reduced because for the remainder, who earn less than the (?relevant) level, it is altogether a matter of indifference whether these taxes are reduced or not. Replying to the question of what this is being done for and why, then it all looks very simple: Behind this outer shell of verbiage there lies nothing but a desire to gain military superiority over the Soviet Union--to attempt to do this once again.

[Speaker B] I would like to say that this is not the first attempt. Similar attempts were made in the fifties by the United States and in the sixties.

What is more, this was done in circumstances when the Soviet Union was economically weaker. Nevertheless all these attempts were foiled by our country--they all proved unsuccessful. Today, when there is an existing strategic parity, an existing approximate military equilibrium in Europe, the United States will not succeed in wrecking this parity, in wrecking this equilibrium.

I would also like to recall another part of the TASS statement on the U.S. decision on the neutron weapon. It says in a clear and precise manner that no one should remain in any doubt that in light of the steps being taken by the United States, the Soviet Union will be duly assessing the situation as it evolves and will undertake the necessary measures to ensure its own security and the security of its friends and allies.

[Levin] The West German newspaper NEUE RUHR-ZEITUNG recently carried an article which said, and I quote: If this is madness, then there is method in it. The countries of the European Economic Community destroyed 1 million tons of good-quality vegetables and fruits in the years 1979-80 in order to maintain market prices at their existing levels. This cost the taxpayers DM250 million. The U.S. Defense Department has drawn up a program which provides for an expenditure of $1.6 trillion on armaments in 1983-87. These two reports from the same day, NEUE REHR-ZEITUNG continues, have no connection with one another but clearly illustrate the madness which reigns in the world and offends human reason. The stormy and angry reaction, which is not emotional but deeply considered and precisely substantiated, to the U.S. President's decision to produce the neutron weapon is clear testimony to the fact that mankind does not wish to accept insults to reason. It is fully determin d to direct the development of international relations into a channel which provides us with a reliable and stable peace. The possibilities for this exist and one can be quite certain that these possibilities will be used to the full.

With that we come to the end of our program. Thank you for your attention, esteemed comrades. All the best.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION--QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS'

LD150820 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 14 Aug 81

["International Situation--Questions and Answers" program presented by all-union radio commentator Kazbek Basev, with international affairs journalist Oleg Nikolayevich Anichkin and candidate of history Konstantin Ivanovich Senenov]

[Excerpts] [Basev] As you already know, esteemed comrades, TASS has issued a statement concerning the decision made by United States President Reagan to begin developing production of the neutron bomb.

Reagan Decision on Bomb

As a result of this decision, made in cynical contempt for the will and interests of the peoples of the globe, the United States' already huge atomic arsenal will be augmented by a new and particularly barbarous means of mass annihilation. The American President's decision, the TASS statement says, shows up particularly clearly the hypocrisy of Washington's assertion that it intends to seek agreement on a reduction of nuclear weapons.

The first letters in which the authors express what all Soviet people feel, a resolute protest against the militarist preparations of Washington, are already reaching our office. We are convinced that the influx of these letters will increase. I will dwell on some of them today. Here, for instance, is a letter from our regular listener of Balashovo, Saratovskaya Oblast, Nikolay Petrovich (Nepershin). He writes that President Reagan's decision is a direct challenge to public opinion, which 3 years ago quite categorically expressed its protest against the United States's plan to create neutron weapons and deploy them on the territory of Western Europe. There is a letter on the same subject from Anatoliy (Shutov) of Berdyansk. Noting that the United States has taken yet another step toward a nuclear catastrophe, he writes: Now, before it is too late, an end should be put to the policy of military blackmail, to the practice of intimidation and aggressive actions. Time will not wait.

Ivan Aleksayevich Savelyev of Moscow stresses that the decision to produce the neutron weapon, alongside the implementation of plans for the creation and deployment of other forms of nuclear weapons including medium-range missiles, shows the farreaching aggressive schemes of Washington.

I am handing these and other letters to a regular participant in our program, international affairs journalist Oleg Nikolayevich Anichkin. Oleg Nikolayevich, I think it would be appropriate to begin our talk with the question asked by listener Kolesov of Novosibirsk. He asks: How does this inhuman decision fit in with the other military-strategic measures of the new United States administration?

[Anichkin] First, this decision is in full accord with the American doctrine of limited nuclear war. Furthermore, neutron weapons will expand the United States' arsenal of nuclear weapons. If one speaks of the European theater of military operations, the neutron weapons--warheads for Lance missiles and nuclear shells for 8-inch guns--will augment the U.S. medium-range delivery systems, the Pershing II and the cruise missiles which the United States intends to deploy in Western Europe according to a 1979 NATO decision. In short, this decision by the American administration shows us once again that Washington is actively striving to implement its main taks, the task which the new administration set for itself as soon as it came to power at the beginning of this year: to achieve military supremacy over the Soviet Union, a total departure from the principles of equality and equal security on which Soviet-American relations have been based in accordance with the existing understandings which, by the way, were reached under a former Republican administration.

[Basev] Oleg Nikolayevich, could you not explain to our listeners just what neutron weapons are?

[Anichkin] This form of weapon is intended purely for killing personnel, i.e., for killing both civilians and military since it has only a radiation effect. This is why these weapons are so monstrous and cannibal-like. Houses, various structures, military equipment, will remain unscathed. Only people will be killed. They will die either at once or slowly and very agonizingly. I do not like to tell the consequences of using neutron weapons. Nevertheless something should be said about this.

Listen to what the Americans themselves write. I quote an excerpt from a U.S. Atomic Energy Commission report entitled "Factors in the Effects of Atomic Weapons." It says that people affected by these weapons experience varying degrees of a state of shock. This state of shock is accompanied by a sick feeling and vomiting. Then fever and internal bleeding occur, the hair falls out, there is rapid emaciation and an acute reduction in the white corpuscle count, and so on. In brief, those whom one might call 'lucky,' can take 2-4 weeks to die. Those who were at a distance of 1 or 2 km from the explosion may survive for years. Is it not a foul, monstrous weapon?

[Basev] Yes. But it appears from reports now coming in from the United States that the Reagan administration is concerned about its decision to produce the neutron bomb looking unattractive and dangerous. That is to say, it seems to have learned the lessons of past years. In this connection, I would like to ask you the question raised by Comrade Kalinkin of Odessa. He asks: What conclusions is Washington putting forward this time to justify its decision to produce the neutron bomb?

[Anichkin] The same ones, nothing new apart from certain nuances applicable to the new situation. First, they want to show that the neutron bomb is not a weapon for the European theater of military operations. In other words, Washington is trying to avoid the barrage of criticism. It seems to me that hardly anyone is likely to believe this conclusion made by American militarists who are advocating this weapon. By their nature, neutron weapons are specifically intended for use in regions with a high density of population. Senator [name indistinct], former deputy supreme commander of NATO Joint Armed Forces in Europe, who knows what he is talking about, declares frankly, and I quote: Neutron weapons are tactical weapons intended for the complete destruction of Europe and the annihilation of Europeans.

Even the American military itself, including the defense secretary, admits that there is no problem in the rapid delivery--in just a few hours--of neutron warheads to Europe. Methods are already now being worked out for the urgent delivery of these weapons to the European Continent.

[Basev] One should also note that the United States is making a great effort to show that neutron weapons are defensive, not offensive.

[Anichkin] That is just what I wanted to continue talking about. To argue in this way is simply to deceive people and lead them astray. Nowadays, it is only the purpose for which a weapon is used that makes it offensive or defensive. All forms of weapons that are capable of being used in seizing the territory of another country are offensive. As a result of neutron weapons being used, the defending side will suffer more than the attacking side. Therefore, this weapon has been thought up for use by an aggressor.

Furthermore, American propaganda would like to represent the neutron weapon as a deterrent. In the past, and now too, new twists to the arms race, the introduction of new weapons systems, tend to be justified by the United States in terms of a desire to exert a deterrent effect on its potential enemy. Does it not seem to you that there are now too many deterrent weapons? This is just a pretext to justify the arms race. Thus far, the creation of new forms of weapons as a deterrent has never stopped the arms race or reduced the danger of a conflict arising. So it seems to me that there is no logic in this.

[Basev] Oleg Nikolayevich, what in your view could be the long-term consequences of the White House's decision?

[Anichkin] They could be very serious. Another attempt is being made to lower the threshold of nuclear war and consequently to make it more probable and possible for it to be waged. Efforts are being made to reconcile people to the possibility, the permissibility, of such a war--that it is normal, if one may put it that way. After the present generation of neutron weapons, another may follow. Thus a new direction will open up in the nuclear arms race, one which has still greater destructive capacity. It would be unrealistic to think that the other side would not take appropriate measures and this, naturally, would bring about a new round of the arms race with all the consequences ensuing from this. To this it can be added that the American decision was made in conditions of an acute worsening of international relations and a deadlock in the matter of negotiations on arms limitation. In brief, I should like to say that the decision of the American administration to produce neutron weapons could have a negative effect on the process of negotiations on limiting the arms race.

[Basev] Alarm on this score is currently being expressed by many statesmen in Europe and elsewhere.

[Anichkin] Yes, protests have already been made by statesmen of Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland and other countries. But there are also politicians who would like to pretend that this is no concern of theirs. Britain, for instance, considers that questions of the production of these weapons are a matter for the United States. They think roughly the same way in Bonn, although they express the hope that the matter will not go as far as the deployment of these weapons on German or European soil. The Italian leader. ip is not making any direct statements but is showing a noticeable concern in attempting to reach an agreed position with the other Western European countries.

The Soviet Union has been and remains a supporter of a total ban on nuclear weapons. Ensuing from this, in 1978 the Soviet Union with a number of other states, introduced a draft convention in the Disarmament Committee banning the production, stockpiling, deployment and utilization of neutron weapons. We declared that we did not intend to produce neutron weapons if the United States or any other state did not do so. The United States was then deaf to our constructive proposal. It is now clear why.

[Basev] Thank you, Oleg Nikolayevich.

Role of NSA

A listener in Kirgizia asks for information about the activity of the United States National Security Agency. Even among the United States espionage departments, the agency occupies a special place. This electronic espionage center, one of the biggest in the world, collects and stores a huge quantity of information of all kinds, which is then made available to various American state organs. The headquarters of the agency is in Fort Meade, Maryland. At this espionage center there are some 24,000 staff members. In United States territory [words indistinct] has over 150 electronic listening posts scattered from Alaska to Florida. As early as the beginning of the 1950's the agency set about implementing Operation Shamrock, under which all international telegrams and telephone conversations were intercepted and information about Americans who were acquainted with citizens of other countries was collected. Later, in the 1960's the Shamrock program was replaced by a more extensive one, under the code name Minaret. By 1975 $5 billion had been spent on both of these operations.

Judging by all the evidence, NSA is a vast organization. Its round-the-clock operations cost more than (?$1.5 billion) annually, that is considerably more than the activity of the CIA. Day and night many thousands of the agency's operatives listen intently to the airwaves at countless interception points scattered across the globe on ships, in aircraft, in spy satellites and at land stations. Investigations conducted by the United States Congress showed that NSA is trying to listen in to signals and operational messages during the launching of Soviet missiles and is intercepting the conversations of air force and tank unit commanders. From what has been said, one may deduce that behind whatever fine-sounding title the espionage department might hide, it has been and remains essentially the child of American imperialism and an instrument for undermining detente.

UN REACTION TO SPACE TREATY PROPOSAL VIEWED

LD141242 Moscow TASS in English 0805 GMT 14 Aug 81

[Text] New York, 14 Aug, TASS--The USSR Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko's letter to the United Nations Secretary General Kurt Waldheim requesting the inclusion of the question of "The Concluson of a Treaty Banning the Deployment in Outer Space of Any Type of Weapons" in the agenda of the 36th General Assembly Session, and the draft of this treaty, perpared by the Soviet Union, have been circulated here as the official documents of the U.N. General Assembly.

United Nations circles point out the opportune nature of the Soviet proposal since the necessity of erecting an international legal barrier in the way of attempts to militarise near-earth space has long been the order of the day.

One of the reports on the latest session of the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space points out that in the course of the discussion delegations from many countries expressed concern over the growing danger of the military uses of outer space. They stressed the need for the earliest possible debate within the United Nations on measures to prevent the arms race in the near-Earth space.

"The world is saturated with weapons. The militarisation of space should not be premitted." Mohamed Hami Ibrahim, Ethiopia's permanent representative to the United Nations, told TASS. One attempt at the militarisation of space, he said was the American "shuttle" program. "The Soviet proposal deserves to be considered most thoroughly".

"Outer space must by no means become an arena of the arms race," declared Peter Florin, the GDR permanent representative to the U.S. "It should remain clear and free from any weapons."

PRAVDA ASSESSES WORK OF MADRID CSCE MEETING

PM141411 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Aug 81 p 4

[Correspondent V. Chernyshev dispatch: "To Justify the Peoples' Hopes"]

[Text] Madrid, August--A recess has been called at the Madrid meeting of representatives of the countries which signed the CSCE's Final Act, which is being held in the Spanish capital's Palace of Congresses. However, interest in the meeting and its prospects is not waning. Currently celebrating the sixth anniversary of the Helsinki conference, which was one of the most significant international events in recent years, the world public expresses the hope that the forum in the Spanish capital will make a worthy contribution to continuing and developing the policy of detente and to strengthening good-neighborly relations among states.

With what results have the meeting participants arrived at the summer recess?

On the whole, these results may be evaluated as positive. In particular, work on the section of the final document devoted to cooperation in the spheres of the economy, science, technology and environmental protection has been completed in full. A big step forward has also been taken in agreeing on the texts of other sections of the final document. Thus, in the section on the principles of relations among states agreement has been reached on such important questions as including the main principles of the Final Act in the participant states' legislation, as well as a whole series of other texts concerning relations among countries, the consolidation of detente, the protection of state's citizens on another state's territory and the struggle against terrorism.

Agreement has been reach[illegible] on virtually the entire text of the mandate on convening a conference on military [illegible]nte and disarmament in Europe, with the exception of a provision relating to t[illegible]one of application of future confidence-building measures and a decision on the venue and timing of the conference.

Significant progress has also been made in work on the section relating to cooperation in humanitarian spheres. This section has aroused increased attention and frequently also sharp debates in the sessions, as it concerns important political and ideological problems of relations among states. However, despite all the difficulties, the meeting participants have largely succeeded in finding mutually acceptable solutions. Agreement has been reached on the majority of formulas in the draft final document relating to the Third basket of the Final Act--on cooperation in humanitarian and other spheres.

In particular, the texts relating to cooperation in the spheres of culture and education have been approved. The formulas on contacts among people have to a considerable extent been agreed on. The sides have not yet reached full agreement on the section on cooperation in the sphere of information. However, the texts adopted reflect a whole series of important provisions concerning problems of disseminating printed information and exchanging information among the participant states, the working conditions of foreign journalists and certain others.

It is important to point out that questions of cooperation in humanitarian spheres have been examined at the Madrid meeting in close connection with the state of and development of the process of detente and of strengthening mutual understanding among peoples, for, as was pointed out at the sessions, it is easier to resolve problems of humanitarian cooperation under conditions of detente and growing trust among states. The delegations of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries believe that, if such an approach to the discussion at the Madrid meeting continues to prevail, this will make it possible also to complete the resolution of other items on the agenda.

Experience of the development of relations among states since the Helsinki conference and experience of the Madrid meeting itself convince us that the continuation of the detente process is of fundamental significance for the successful implementation of all the Final Act's provisions.

The majority of the delegations are firmly confident that there are no insuperable ostacles preventing us from arriving at a mutually accepta' e settlement of the problems which have not yet been resolved. The national delegations must use the summer period to make a careful analysis of the present state of affairs at the Madrid meeting and to seek ways to resolve the remaining problems, above all the question of convening a conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe.

Life itself placed the idea of convening such a conference at the center of the delegations' attention, making it the chief issue at the Madrid meeting.

The overwhelming majority of the participants in the forum in the Spanish capital realize that there is no sensible alternative to detente and that all peoples are interested in it. It is no coincidence that none of the delegations has directly opposed convening such a conference. The socialist countries' representatives have repeatedly pointed out at the sessions in Madrid that the adoption of a constructive decision on this issue would help to strengthen stability and security on the European Continent and improve relations among states. The European people's assessment of the results of the Madrid meeting and the further development of the detente process depend on the resolution of this question.

The Soviet Union's peace initiatives advanced by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev from the platform of the 26th CPSU Congress and in his recent speeches open up a broad prospect for the success of the Madrid forum. They also help, given the good will of all the meeting participants, to reach agreement on convening a conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe. The USSR's proposals have met with understanding and broad support at the sessions in Madrid.

However, through the fault of those who tried right from the start to divert the delegates from resolving the chief problems troubling mankind, it took a considerable time before it was understood that the Soviet initiatives cannot go unanswered. The question now is to see that, with regard to the Soviet Union's new proposals, the Madrid forum can make decisions satisfactory to all sides on such a key problem as determining the zone of strengthening confidence-building measures and security on a balanced mutual basis with regard to the equality of the rights and responsibilities of all the European conference participant states.

Although there are still substantial differences in the positions of the groups of states, the Soviet Union has taken an important step toward the Western partners. It is natural to expect now that the West will also demonstrate readiness for constructive steps and that the understanding of the importance of the USSR's initiatives will result in agreement being reached on convening a conference.

For a long time the NATO countries' delegations in point of fact refused to conduct any talks whatever on this question. When they finally placed their own proposals on the negotiating table, they at once hastened to call them "the absolute limit" and a kind of "final truth" ["istina v posledney instantsii"]. In this connection the NATO countries organized a noisy propaganda campaign aimed at literally lauding their draft to the skies and almost anathematizing the constructive Soviet proposal. In a number of instances this propaganda action went far beyond generally accepted diplomatic norms.

The calling of a recess in the work of the Madrid meeting was grounds for various kinds of speculation in the Western press. In particular, some reports appeared distorting the delegations' positions on this issue. Attempts were made to misinform the public. Here it is necessary to make things quite clear.

Right from the start the Soviet delegation urged people to display political will and impart to the forum the pace which would ensure the timely completion of its work. Our delegation did not plan to have either this "summer break," although it did agree to it, or the preceding "spring vacation." The Soviet Union's representatives believe that the meeting's work could have been concluded considerably earlier. Only the reluctance of certain delegations to reckon with the realities of the international situation and with the sentiments of the peoples of Europe and their reluctance to take into consideration the fact that questions such as military detente in Europe urgently demand the speediest resolution resulted in the artificial protraction of the meeting.

Attempts are now being made to lay the blame, as the saying goes, at someone else's door. It is paradoxical, but these attempts are being made precisely by those who are directly to blame for the delay and for the fact that the Madrid meeting's final document has still not been adopted.

The Soviet Union knows the value of time and does not intend to waste it on empty talk. In this case, however, the positive outcome of the Madrid meeting is of far greater significance to it than the time factor. The reaching of agreement on a very wide range of issues, including, of course, the convening of a conference on military detente and disarmament, would create favorable conditions for continuing the process begun by the Helsinki conference.

The USSR delegation comes out against the position of individual countries whose representatives, referring to the duration of the Madrid meeting, call for it to be concluded with the adoption of some "formal" document. It is necessary to achieve real, practical results in order to preserve the spirit of the Helsinki accords in the final document, to give them a new boost and to justify the peoples' hopes of peaceful development in Europe.

Despite the fact that the Madrid meeting was unable to fulfill the earlier adopted decision on the need to complete its work in July, it reached agreement on many important issues, including on a number of texts with a military aspect. Time has not been wasted. The forum participants have arrived at the recess in the clear understanding that, if good will is shown, it is possible in the very near future to achieve positive results under all sections of the Final Act.

...Across the road from the main entrance to Madrid's Palace of Congresses, where the meeting is being held, during the time that the last stage of the sessions has been going on local construction workers have had time to erect a 30-story tower block. This has given journalists a pretext for numerous jokes and comparisons. Well, it is possible to make comparisons. The meeting participants are seeking to make their contribution to building a strong edifice of peace, in which all peoples would live in good neighborliness and security. It is not easy to erect such an edifice.

It is easy to imagine what would happen if each "team" built its own floor according to its own plans, uncoordinated with the others. Such a building would inevitably collapse even before its roof had been put on. Of course, each "team" can have its own tastes and its own ideas about construction methods, but the edifice of peace will only be strong when constructed according to a unified and carefully coordinated plan. A sound foundation for such an edifice exists. It is the final act of the all-European conference, on which the world's peoples pin their hopes of life without wars, without the arms race and without fear for the future.

CPSU SENDS CRITICAL LETTER TO JAPANESE COMMUNISTS

Part I

OW111131 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 8 Aug 81

[Part I of CPSU Central Committee's letter to the Japan Communist Party Central Committee dated 30 July--read by announcer]

[Text] A letter which your party sent through the Soviet Embassy in Japan on 15 June and which they published on the same day has been carefully studied. We have noted that your party's letter was carried in bourgeois newspapers in Japan and that they assessed it [words indistinct] as an extensive criticism of Soviet foreign policy.

We are of the impression that your party published the letter solely to display your differences with the CPSU. The letter will enlarge and intensify the arguments which your party has been one-sidedly carrying out against our party for nearly 1 and 1/2 years.

In the letter from your party, we clearly see your notion that the Soviet Union is responsible for a considerable part of the current tension in the international arena. For example, the letter declares that the Soviet Union created the circumstances for the aggravation of tension to prevail--with good intentions--by violating the people's right of self-determination through its armed intervention into Afghanistan, etc.

This kind of interpretation is either the outcome of self-deception or an intentional fabrication, which is even worse. As a matter of fact, imperialism is now trying to use the so-called Afghan issue and the current Polish problem as an excuse for refusing the detente policy and keying up tention. Bourgeois propaganda is striving to make believe that the present, complicated international situation can be attributed to events in Afghanistan. However, numerous facts prove the contrary.

The decision by NATO to replenish arms and deploy the new-type medium-range missiles in West Europe was made before the events in Afghanistan. It was also before the events in Afghanistan that the policy for stepping up Japanese-U.S. military cooperation and Japan's militarization was adopted. In addition, the imperialist maneuvers against People's Kampuchea and Socialist Vietnam also began before the events in Afghanistan.

The failure of the United States to ratify the U.S.-Soviet SALT II treaty was said to be the result of events in Afghanistan; however, a recent statement by a leading U.S. Government official proves that this was not true and that the SALT II treaty was not ratified because it blocked the move toward a new stage of the arms race.

It is absolutely clear that the events in Afghanistan were used as an excuse for expediting the implementation of a policy which the United States and its allies had begun against the Soviet Union and the socialist camp before the events in Afghanistan. If it were not for this excuse, imperialism would have found another excuse to conceal its real aim of regaining its one-time military supremacy. It is to attain this very aim that the militarist clique led by U.S. imperialism has begun an arms race on an unprecedented scale. The clique rules out negotiations such as checking a process toward armament, removing causes of disputes, and resolving pending international problems through peaceful means. It is pursuing and encouraging open acts of aggression and international burglary overseas without feeling any shame.

There is no doubt whatsoever that the responsibility for the current high international tension and the increasing risk of war rests exactly with imperialism. In this complex situation, the Soviet Union is continuing a persistent struggle to remove the threat of war and assure each person of the primary right, that is, the right to exist.

The Soviet Union is intimidating no one, nor does it intend to stand against any country. The Soviet Union has not and is not now pursuing the attainment of military supremacy; it has never taken the initiative in starting a new stage of the arms race.

The guarantee for peace was and is the most important goal of Soviet diplomacy. We are convinced that the Soviet Union's peace diplomacy is not only serving the interest of the Soviet people but is also benefiting the whole of mankind. Therefore, we cannot but be surprised at the contention of your party that the call for support to the diplomatic initiative of the 26th CPSU Congress is blocking the development of international democratic movement.

The initiative shown at our party congress is, in a way, the minimum platform in the struggle against the arms race and the danger of war under contemporary conditions. The platform objectively reflects not only the demands of communist parties but also the demands of other political forces, namely, socialist democratic parties, labor unions, other popular organizations, and religious circles. This has been attested to by the fact that the platform is increasingly gaining wide support in various countries. We regret that the Soviet initiative aimed at relieving various nations of the threat of nuclear war and maintaining world peace did not earn the support of the Japan Communist Party.

In the letter from your party, it was asserted that the CPSU designates itself as the vanguard or center of the international communist movement and even tries to force this notion on other political parties. We are not trying to play such a role, but we also do not intend to forget historic facts. Socialist revolution won its first victory in Russia, and consequently the Soviet Union--the first socialist state in the world--was born.

Socialism not only withstood the life-and-death struggle with fascism--the most brutal form of imperialism--but also conquered it, thereby saving many nations from enslavement. As a result of this victory, favorable conditions for the formation of a world socialist system were created.

Because of its economic and defense capabilities, the Soviet Union today is a vital part of the world socialist system and the work for world peace. All this represents the reality ordained by the course of historical development. Therefore, it is no accident that imperialism has always concentrated--and is now concentrating--its attack on the Soviet Union, regarding the Soviet Union as a major obstacle blocking its policy of aggression. Actions by the present U.S. Government most eloquently prove this.

Many progressive forces have always supported--and are now supporting--the state where socialism won its first victory, rightly regarding it as a fortress for all forces of peace and democracy. Internationalist solidarity of the working class and progressive forces of the world has been--and is now--one of the major sources of the Soviet Union's power. This solidarity has not weakened but has further strengthened along with the growth of socialism. This solidarity is based on the understanding that Soviet foreign policy represents the evident desire of the progressive forces for peace, democracy and social progress.

The letter from your party, however, emphasized the importance of and necessity for criticism of the Soviet Union and its policies, asserting that such an attitude was not anti-Soviet. However, there are various kinds of criticism. There is sound criticism which does not deviate attention from the major theme, "need for cooperation in the struggle for common objectives"; but, there is also an intentional attack that distorts the significance and nature of Soviet policies and matches ill-willed slanders of imperialist propaganda.

In either case, we cannot accept as mere criticism the assertion that the Soviet Union is infringing on the Afghan people's national right to self-determination and is taking unjust actions against Poland. Such an assertion does not reflect reality and it can only be assessed as an expression of anti-Sovietism when its practical details are considered.

We will not go into details on the Afghan problem in this letter since we know that comrades in Afghanistan were obliged to send a letter to your party that carries their assessment of the real nature of events in Afghanistan. At the same time, they were also obliged to give their view of the Afghan issue through newspapers. The JCP has often been invited to send delegations to Afghanistan, and if your party really wants to know what took place and what is now happening in Afghanistan it can do so any time.

Regrettably, delegations from the JCP and reporters of the newspaper AKAHATA, in particular, believe that it is proper for them to [word indistinct] information on Afghanistan from all sources including the U.S. State Department, while failing to [words indistinct] from the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. Such an attitude [words indistinct] appears to have influenced the position of your party.

As for the Polish situation, we sent another letter to your party to explain our position. Judging from your party's reply dated 4 July, your party did not accept our explanations. Who is right has now been determined by life itself.

The congress of the Polish communists fully and clearly revealed their views on what they see as dangers to socialism and national independence and where those dangers lie; who they consider are their real friends; and who they see as wanting to deepen the crisis and for what purposes. At the PZPR Congress Comrade Kania said: We will not allow anyone to attempt to intervene in Polish domestic affairs and to break our friendly relationship of alliance with the Soviet Union.

In his speech Comrade Jaruzelski pointed out that under the current international situation neither Polish communists nor other communists can be indifferent to the general development in Poland's domestic situation or to the position and role of Poland in peace and the system of socialism. Comrade Jaruzelski also stressed that the task of safeguarding the national borders, independence, and sovereignty--a national task that is really important for Poland--can only be fully attained through the commonality of socialist interest and the internationalistic nature of this interest.

The PZPR Congress appeal to the Polish people clearly stated that the communists in Poland will fight those who attempt to divert Poland from the way of socialist development and lead it to bad terms with its allies, particularly the Soviet Union.

In light of this, it is clear that the JCP Central Committee statement that it would like to defend the self-determination right of the Polish people makes no sense at all. As pointed out at the PZPR Congress, the undermining of the good-neighborly relations between the Soviet Union and Poland, which the enemy of socialist Poland seeks, will never strengthen Poland's national independence but will expose this national independence to the grave, real threat from the imperialist forces.

It is our impression that an intentional, major campaign is under way to give false reports--which would objectively stir up a sense of distrust in the CPSU, the Soviet Union, and its policies--to the JCP and to lead it to erroneous judgments.

Your party is objectively playing the same role as the one described by again making an appeal related to the unfounded, unreal territorial claim. The assertion that as long as the territorial claim against the Soviet Union cannot be met it would be difficult to establish a real relationship of trust between Japan and the Soviet Union is nothing new. We know that the Japanese Government has a view which is basically the same as your party's, although the two differ in their specific demands.

Our position on Japan's territorial claim against the Soviet Union is well known. This position has been explained repeatedly and directly to the delegations of the JCP at the Moscow talks in December 1979 and through a letter dated 2 July 1980. There is no change in our position that an unresolved territorial issue does not exist in the relationship between Japan and the Soviet Union. Our party has never promised to return the territory which your party is demanding.

Part II

OW140558 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1400 GMT 8 Aug 81

[Part II of the CPSU Central Committee's letter to the Japan Communist Party Central Committee dated 30 July--read by announcer]

[Text] We cannot but note the fact that your reply contains a series of substantial distortions of Soviet foreign policies in the area of our struggle to insure peace and security for various nations. For instance, you assert in your reply that CPSU slogans since its 25th congress which call for simultaneous dissolution of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO, prohibition of nuclear weapons and the removal of all military bases have disappeared. In fact, they have not. At the 26th CPSU Congress, Comrade Brezhnev recalled the 1978 Soviet proposal on starting a [word indistinct] reduction aimed at the suspension of nuclear weapons production and their abolition.

As everyone knows, the Soviet Union has been consistently damanding an overall and complete ban on nuclear weapons testing. The USSR Supreme Soviet appeal adopted on 23 June 1981 and addressed to the parliaments and peoples of all countries states that there are no arms which the USSR thinks cannot be placed under limitations or prohibited under agreements with other countries and on the basis of reciprocity.

Our position on ending military blocs has not changed. In his speech at the 35th UN General Assembly session on 23 September 1980, Foreign Minister Gromyko pointed out that the statement repeated many times in the past by the Soviet Union and other socialist nations that the Warsaw Treaty Organization will be dissolved if NATO is dissolved at the same time, that they are ready for a mutual cutback on military activities, and that as the first step they are ready for the mutual disbanding of military organizations still remains perfectly valid.

Our position concerning military bases and troops stationed in foreign countries is as negative as before. The Soviet Union is demonstrating this position even under today's complex international conditions. For example, it unilaterally withdrew 20,000 troops, 1,000 tanks and other arms from the GDR. On many occasions it declared that it would consider withdrawing its troops from Afghanistan if the solution of issues involved in a political settlement, including that of security for Afghanistan, is guaranteed.

You called on the USSR and other socialist nations to take a new initiative in international affairs, to end the vicious cycle in the arms race and to completely abolish all military bases. Our country has constantly presented its proposals on major issues. In recent years no country in the world have made proposals so specific, realistic and broad before mankind as has the Soviet Union.

In this connection, it should be noted that it is not logical to contrast such UN resolutions as you quoted in your reply to Soviet foreign policies. Many UN resolutions, including the one concerning the disarmament issue, were adopted by Soviet initiative or through its positive support.

In the future, too, we will, together with other socialist countries, continue to display our initiative over the issues of an end to the arms race and disarmament including nuclear disarmament. Displaying the initiative alone is not sufficient. It is necessary to bring proposals into realization. The Soviet Union will also continue its consistent efforts to that end in the future.

Your letter asserts that Soviet foreign policy is based on the concept of a military power equilibrium, and attempts to create an impression that this concept is actually aimed at achieving a military superiority. In our view, this case involves two different issues. On one hand, a real military and strategic balance exists between the USSR and the United States, between the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO, which is objectively contributing to the preservation of peace on earth under present circumstances. This is a reality which no one can deny.

On the other hand, the Soviet Union and the United States differ in their positions toward the existing military and strategic balance. As already stated, the Soviet Union has never sought and is not seeking military superiority. While insisting on equality and equal security, we are seeking limitations and a strategic arms reduction. We do not regard the present level of the military and strategic balance as permanent and unchangeable. We will never think of increasing that level through a new phase in the arms race. It is our belief that the balance should be maintained by a mutual arms reduction in the future.

The U.S. position is different from ours. Under the Reagan administration, in particular, Washington has been attempting to break the existing military balance. In order to insure military superiority, it is attempting to impose a new, more dangerous phase in the arms race. However, the USSR and the socialist community states cannot and will not allow the present military balance to be disrupted.

You have criticized the USSR for attaching importance to a dialogue with the United States. In the capitalist world, however, the United States is in a leading position and has the greatest military capabilities. Therefore, in conducting negotiations concerning an end to the arms race, disarmament and nuclear warfare prevention, such negotiations must first involve the United States. The fact that the United States is entrusted with negotiations with the USSR by its NATO allies makes it even more obvious.

We of course do not deny our participation in other activities aimed at strengthening peace and security. The Soviet Union takes an active part in the activities of the Disarmament Committee and has made many important proposals, together with other socialist nations. Our country has advanced a proposal for convening a world disarmament conference. Also, a Soviet delegation will take an active part in the UN General Assembly special session on disarmament scheduled for 1982.

Needless to say, the joint effort of all the peace forces in the world is of great significance. Our party therefore stressed to the JCP that under the present circumstances it is extremely important to bring an increasingly broad segment of people and political forces into the antiwar struggle and that doing so is a central task in the present struggle to push the international tide toward detente. It was from this point of view that the CPSU Central Committee asked the Japanese comrades to express their views on various important current issues and problems in the struggle to insure peace and security for all nations.

Unfortunately, there has been no specific and affirmative response on your part. For example, our proposal for working out measures to strengthen mutual trust in the military area in the Far East and putting them to work points to an extremely important requirement under the present situation, but you flatly rejected it without giving it constructive study.

We have never asked the JCP or other democratic forces in Japan to accept the presence of the Self-Defense Forces and U.S. military bases in Japan, although you claim that we did. To do so would have run counter to our position which is well known to our Japanese comrades.

Furthermore, it should be kept in mind that the Soviet proposal for measures to strengthen mutual trust in the Far East is addressed not only to Japan but to all nations in the region as well, and to the United States whose vast armed forces deployed in the Far East are seriously threatening peace.

We are fully aware that the situation in the Far East is considerably different from that in Europe. It, therefore, was pointed out at the 26th CPSU Congress that in working out measures to strengthen mutual trust, the unique factors in the Far East situation should be taken into consideration. The basic significance of such measures is that they should not only help ease the tension in the region but also contribute to consolidating the foundations of world peace. We believe that this is in the interest of all nations, including Japan.

We would like to take up another issue raised in your letter. You assert that so far, all the views expressed by representatives of Japanese democratic forces at international forums have been ignored. Needless to say, no one can blame Soviet delegates for the actions taken by international democratic groups. Speaking of Soviet delegates, they have always strived to establish friendly and businesslike contacts with Japanese delegates. At the same time, however, we cannot ignore the impression of many activists of international democratic movements that representatives of the various Japanese organizations affiliated with the JCP regard it as their primary task to sidetrack other participants at international forums from discussing concrete tasks in the anti-imperialist struggle.

For instance, in their speeches at the world youth and student festival for peace, detente and disarmament in Helsinki in January 1981, delegates of the Japanese Democratic Youth League attacked the Soviet Union from the beginning to the end in connection with the developments in Afghanistan, and they did so in such a way as if they had the blessing of the international youth movement. It is natural that such an attitude gets no support from other participants, is it not?

Your letter cites various common and fundamental tasks indicating the basic direction in easing today's extreme international tensions--tasks that have been tested in the anti-imperialist, peace and democratic struggle since World War I. They include a total ban on nuclear arms, withdrawal of foreign troops from all countries, the disbanding of military blocs, extensive and thorough disarmament, protection of the right to national self-determination, and noninterference in national liberation movements. Our party is not only not opposed to them; it is carrying on a ceaseless struggle to fulfill these as well as other urgent tasks.

Everyone knows that we support the Japanese people's struggle for the abrogation of the Japan-U.S. security treaty. We also condemn the militarist trend in Japan as profoundly as the JCP members do. The Soviet people have always supported Japan's struggle for its three nonnuclear principles.

Your letter refers to a document of the JCP Central Committee entitled "For a True Peace Program." The peace struggle tasks indicated in the program are basically the same as reflected in the slogans we have been upholding for a long time. The Soviet Union has already made proposals along the same lines on many occasions. It is absurd therefore to try to find differences between the tasks suggested by the JCP and Soviet foreign policy.

For instance, you stress the right to national self-determination while referring to the Afghan question. The Soviet Union also insists on the right to national self-determination but it does not stop at merely putting up a slogan. The Soviet Union put the slogan to work a long time ago. It extends concrete aid to places threatened by the imperialist forces.

It is precisely this kind of aid that has been extended to Afghanistan in compliance with the treaty between the USSR and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and with the UN Charter recognition of the collective right to self-defense.

You repeatedly quote a passage from the joint communique on the 1979 Moscow talks between the CPSU and JCP delegations saying that: No export of revolution shall be allowed. We have held on firmly to this principle. However, whenever you quote the above-mentioned statement, you omit a very important passage which says: this does not run counter to our positive support for and solidarity with those peoples who are fighting against imperialist aggression and oppression and for national independence.

The attack on Soviet foreign policy has reached a level where even such an intolerable term as "social imperialism" is used. We reject such attacks as an insult and as harmful and foolish. We believe that there still exist broad foundations of cooperation between our two parties in our struggle against imperialism and for peace. The fact that such foundations exist was affirmed at the December 1979 talks in Moscow between the delegations of the CPSU and the JCP. As you know, the joint communique on the talks listed issues on which the two parties concurred or on which their positions were close. The joint communique also stated that further development of solidarity in the international communist movement based on principled foundations is of great significance in strengthening solidarity among the world's anti-imperialist forces in the defense of world peace and national sovereignty and against the imperialists' policy of aggression and interference.

Your letter, however, does not even mention the issues on which the two parties concurred. It shows no trace of any effort to promote the solidarity between the two parties and to strengthen international solidarity.

Your letter is written in a rude style unbecoming of a communist party that cherishes self-pride and upholds internationalist principles. You try to convey the criticisms of communist parties of various countries but your letter is like a sermon and allows no refutation and in fact tramples on the spirit of those criticisms.

Deliberately playing up differences in views is not in the interest of the JCP or the international communist movement. Noisy polemics alone, without efforts to promote joint actions against imperialism and for world peace, can hardly be expected to bring about progress. We believe that we can overcome differences in views in the course of the joint struggle. Our party is prepared to develop its cooperation with the JCP on the basis of the joint communique of the December 1979 talks in Moscow between the two parties.

We feel that cooperation between communist party members of the two nations in the joint anti-imperialist struggle and in the struggle to strengthen the peace and security of all nations is of urgent necessity, particularly in the present international situation including that in the Far East. This calls for regular and extensive contacts between representatives of the two parties at various levels and for regular exchanges between representativesof Soviet and Japanese mass organizations.

[Signed] the CPSU Central Committee, 30 July 1981

REPORT, COMMENTARY ON DPRK LIBERATION DAY

Moscow Meeting Held

SK151052 Moscow in Korean to Korea 1130 GMT 14 Aug 81

[Text] A meeting of social circles convened in Moscow on 13 August to mark the 36th anniversary of Korea's liberation from foreign aggressors.

Speakers at the meeting noted that the Korean people won freedom and independence as a result of the Soviet Army's role as a liberator struggling against foreign forces. They said the cooperative relations between the Soviet Union and the DPRK have developed in the interests of the peoples of both countries.

On the occasion of the Korean people's Liberation Day, the AUCCTU sent a message to the Central Committee of the General Federation of Trade Unions of Korea. The message read as follows:

The liberation of Korea on 15 August added a new chapter to the histories of the Soviet and Korean peoples. The past was characterized by the development and consolidation of friendship and comprehensive cooperation between the workers of the Soviet Union and the DPRK and between the trade unions of the two countries based on the principle of Marxism and Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Other Soviet organizations, such as the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee, the Presidium of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries and the Soviet-Korean Friendship Society Central Committee, sent messages to the DPRK.

Korolev Comment

LD151212 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 15 Aug 81

[Text] Fifteen August is a red letter day in the history of the Korean nation. On that day in 1945 Korea was fully liberated from the Japanese colonial rule. Commentary is by Radio Moscow news analyst, Vladimir Korolev:

The Soviet Armed Forces routed the elite forces of Japanese imperialism in Manchuria and Korea during the last stage of World War II. This had a decisive impact on the outcome of the liberation struggle of the Korean people and it gave the green light to national independence. In the north of the country a state of workers and peasants, the DPRK, was formed. Today, the state is an industrialized socialist country. The peaceful endeavors of the working people of the republic are taking place under complicated conditions of the division of Korea. Time has convincingly shown that the main obstacle in the way to peaceful reunification of the country lies in the American military presence in the Korean Peninsula. At present there are some 40,000 American servicemen with modern weapons, including nuclear weapons. There, Washington intends to deploy new medium-range nuclear missiles in South Korea and Beijing, guided by its hegemonistic interests in the Far East, is frankly blessing the American military presence in the region. All this is deepening tensions in the region, is having a negative effect on the entire situation there.

Voicing the aspirations of the broad masses, the Government of the DPRK is constantly advocating speedy implementation of constructive measures to solve the Korean problem. These efforts are being supported by world public opinion and the Soviet Union is insisting on the people of Korea being allowed to independently decide their own future. In a message to the leadership of the republic, the Soviet leaders, Leonid Brezhnev and Nikolay Tikhonov said that the years following the liberation of Korea have shown that the relations between the Soviet Union and the DPRK accord with the interests of their peoples, with the interests of peace and security in the Far East and throughout the world. The Soviet Union has advanced an important initiative to lessen tensions in the entire Far East. It has advocated the drawing-up and application of measures of mutual trust in the region where the Soviet Union, China and Japan are neighbors, and where there is a network of American military bases. The Soviet Union is ready to engage in concrete talks on confidence measures in the Far East with all parties concerned. This initiative is not directed against anybody. Another important proposal has been advanced by Mongolia--to draw up and sign a convention on nonaggression and the nonuse of force in the relations among the states of the region.

These initiatives of the socialist states demonstrate their sincere interest in lessening tension in the region, in establishing a lasting peace and good-neighborly relations among the states in that part of the world.

Mikhaylov on Soviet Aid

SK160828 Moscow in Korean to Korea 1330 GMT 15 Aug 81

[Mikhaylov commentary]

[Text] August 15, 1945, is a significant day in the history of the Soviet-Korean relations. The Soviet Armed Forces defeated the elite forces of the Japanese imperialist militarists and liberated the Korean people, who had long struggled against foreign oppressors. A favorable condition was created in North Korea for the victory of the revolution of people's democracy and for socialist development. The workers of People's Korea have made their country an industrialized and agricultural country in a short period under the assistance and guidance of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The brilliant achievements of People's Korea show the vitality and efficiency of the new relations forged among the socialist countries. These relations are based on the principles of socialist internationalism, complete equality, reciprocity and fraternal mutual assistance.

Soviet-Korean friendship was launched in August 1945. It has since been developed and consolidated. We feel the fraternal cooperation and close economic ties between our two countries are producing good results and many benefits. With the help of Soviet technology, 60 large industrial enterprises and other facilities, which are the foundation of the DPRK's economy, have been rehabilitated, improved or built. Among these are the Pukchang thermal powerplant--the largest of its kind in Asia, the Pyongyang capacitor plant and the Pyongyang thermal powerplant, and the Kim Chaek iron complex, which accounts for half of the country's production. At important facilities of the DPRK national economy, Soviet and Korean technicians work shoulder to shoulder. The cooperation between the Soviet Union and the DPRK in the fields of trade, economy, science and technology is great.

In reviewing the friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Korea, Comrade Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Korean Workers' Party Central Committee and president of the DPRK, said: The Soviet Union is our people's liberator and a most trusted friend. Whenever our people faced ordeals in the struggle to achieve freedom and independence and to construct a new life, the Soviet people offered help and inspired us.

The friendship and unity between the Soviet Union and Korea, which emerged from the flames of the struggle for liberation and were developed and consolidated on the path taught by the great Lenin, are immortal and firm. The treaty of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance between the Soviet Union and the DPRK, concluded in October 1961, is an important foundation for Soviet-Korean relations. It was aimed at consolidating peace and security in the Far East.

The Soviet people have always expressed solidarity with the struggle of the Korean people for the immediate and complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Korea and for the nation's peaceful and democratic reunification. The Soviet people resolutely support the DPRK's constructive proposal which provides a way to normalize the situation on the Korean Peninsula and to achieve the country's reunification without outside interference. Comrade Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, reaffirmed this at the 26th CPSU Congress.

On the occasion of Korean liberation day, an important day in the history of Soviet-Korean relations, the Soviet people express fraternal congratulations to the workers of People's Korea and wish them greater successes in the struggle to build socialism and achieve peaceful and democratic reunification.

NOVOYE VREMYA VIEWS IRAN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

PM141605 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 32, 7 Aug 81 pp 8-9

[P. Mezentsev article: "Election of a New President"]

[Text] Elections have been held in Iran for a new president of the republic. On the same day, 24 July, deputies to the Majlis (parliament) were elected--there were 50 vacant seats.

The new, second president of the Islamic Republic of Iran, after the ousted A. Bani-Sadr, is Mohammad 'Ali Raja'i, who was prime minister before the elections. In essence he had no serious competitors during the election campaign. Of the 71 candidates put forward for the presidency by various parties and groupings, the council for the observance of the fulfillment of the constitution, whose duties include checking the candidates' loyalty to the present regime, approved the candidacy of three people, apart from Raja'i: 'A.A. Parvaresh, deputy speaker of the Majlis; H. Asgar-Owladi-Mosalman, Majlis deputy for Tehran; and A. Sheybani, former minister of agriculture and founder of the ruling Islamic Republican Party (IRP). These three, unlike M. 'A. Raja'i, who is not a party member, are members of the IRP. In the course of the election campaign all of them called on the voters to vote for the prime minister.

The elections took place in a complex atmosphere. Opposition groupings were threatening a "blood bath" on that day. Attempts were made on the lives of parliamentary candidates on the eve of the vote in certain provincial cities, and also in Tehran itself. In Esfahan, H. Beheshti (nephew of Ayatollah M.H. Beheshti, who was killed in a bomb explosion), a Majlis candidate, was killed. A candidate for the presidency, H. Asgar-Owladi-Mosalman was also slightly wounded. But an attempt on the life of another presidential candidate--A.A. Parvaresh--was prevented.

The number of fires, explosions and cases of sabotage increased. Antigovernment groupings were counting on intimidating voters in this way and making them stay at home. The government, in its turn, adopted measures to neutralize forces hostile to it and ensure the voters' safety. Searches and arrests took place everywhere.

AFP reports that a boycott of the elections was also urged by A. Bani-Sadr, who proposed that the regime's opponents create an "opposition council" in Tehran as a kind of national parliament. This was the former president's last appeal before his flight to France, where he has now been granted political asylum on condition that he does not engage in political activity on French territory.

There is speculation in the foreign press about A. Bani-Sadr's future actions. The Paris newspaper LE MATIN, for instance, suggests that his arrival in France will lead to the unification of hitherto scattered forces opposed to the Khomeyni regime which are abroad. However, the shah's prime minister, Bakhtiar, who is living in France has excluded that possibility, recalling that Bani-Sadr was himself a leading figure in the Khomeyni regime. London's FINANCIAL TIMES holds a different view. It regards the flight of Bani-Sadr, and at the same time of the leader of one of the biggest mass organizations, the Mojahedin-e Khalq (Fighters for the People's Cause), M. Rajavi, as an indication "that these figures see no chance of success in their struggle in the near future."

The tense atmosphere in the country did not influence the election results. According to official figures more than 14 million voters came to the polling booths. Complete victory was secured by M.'A. Raja'i as the "most loyal follower of Imam Khomeyni's course": about 13 million people voted for him. His candidacy was supported by over 1,500 organizations and groups, including the IRP.

In accordance with the country's Constitution the new president was sworn in and signed the oath at a session of parliament. For his part, Khomeyni, the leader of the Iranian revolution, confirmed Raja'i in his new post by a special firman (decree). As M. J. Bahonar, general secretary of the IRP and Iranian minister of education, has stated, in the near future the party's first congress will take place, to elaborate its policy line in various spheres of activity. After the congress a government reshuffle will take place.

SITUATION IN HERAT VIEWED; INTERFERENCE SCORED

LD162034 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 16 Aug 81

[Dispatch by group of Soviet journalists from DRA]

[Excerpts] Herat is clearly divided into two parts--the old and the new. The Herat provincial committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan occupies a mansion that used to belong to a local (?rich man) who fled abroad. The committee's secretary, (Mokham Madin Zakin), is rather young; he's just turned 30, and we began talking about the situation in Herat first where life is not quite back to normal yet. Despite the enemies' of the revolution designs, the secretary said, the situation here, just like elsewhere in the country, is getting back to normal. Crops, including cotton, were sown this spring quite all right. The bodies of the new government are getting stronger in the districts, but, we can't be satisfied as yet. The counterrevolutionaries haven't laid down arms and several gangs keep operating on the territory of the province. More than 150 of our people have been killed this year. Ensuring security is one of our main concerns; at times all members of the party's district committees join combat operations.

Unexpectedly, one pressing problem emerged: provision of salt. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries came to the assistance of Afghanistan and they supplied the fuel and the commodities that were needed. At the same time, relying on local resources, the Afghan Government has been trying to reduce to the minimum the effects of cessation of trade with a number of countries. For example, salt mines in Herat have decided to overreach output targets by 10 times and to supply different parts of the country with 30 tons of salt. Soviet machinery has been supplied to Herat to set up the area's first machine and tractor station. We have had many meetings in Herat Province with party functionaries, workers, peasants, soldiers, traders and mullahs, of course. We were told one thing: Despite the undeclared war against Afghanistan by forces of imperialism and reaction, the process of further democratic transformations in the country is benefiting the majority of the working people.

Ponomarev Commentary

LD162336 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 16 Aug 81

[Text] The BAKHTAR news agency reports that the Afghan Army and security service units have wiped out in Herat Province one more band of mercenaries infiltrated in Afghanistan.

Washington and Beijing, our commentator Leonid Ponomarev points out, are escalating their undeclared war against Afghanistan. Evidence from mercenaries captured or taken prisoner, their documents and arms, show that another large group of counterrevolutionaries trained by American, Egyptian and Chinese intructors in camps on Pakistani territory is being sent to Afghanistan. The arms captured from routed bands now on display in the city of Jalalabad vividly demonstrate the multisided character of interference in the affairs of the Afghan people. As the American magazine NEW REPUBLIC reports, the CIA has already for a long period sponsored and coordinated a largescale program of secret shipments of arms to the so-called Afghan rebels, or in other words to mercenaries and bandits. The program is financed chiefly by the administration in Washington.

What should be noted here is that Pakistan is playing a special role in the armed aggression of reactionary forces against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. As the Afghan paper HAQIQAT-E ENQELAB-E SAWR' puts it, Washington and Beijing have turned Pakistani territory into a springboard of provocations and acts of aggression against Pakistan's neighbors. In the anti-Afghan campaign, Pakistan serves not only as a transit base or a place of refuge for Afghan counterrevolutionaries.

The regime of Ziaul Haq is getting more and more active in the confrontation with Afghanistan on its own initiative which contradicts Pakistan's status of a nonaligned country. The United States administration plans to give three billion dollars in military-economic aid to the Islamabad regime in the coming 5-years. A large part of the American weapons to be delivered to Pakistan is assigned for intervention against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. It is obvious that the Washington-Islamabad alliance is fraught with serious consequences which are likely to further aggravate the situation around Afghanistan.

At their meeting in the Crimea last month, the Soviet leader, Leonid Brezhnev, and the Afghan leader, Babrak Karmal, noted that as a result of interference from a number of imperialist countries, the hegemonistic forces and their allies, the cause of a political settlement of the problems connected with Afghanistan has so far failed to make any concrete headway. At the same time, it was stressed that such a settlement can be achieved and that the well-known proposals of the Soviet Union and Afghanistan provide a good basis for it. The essence of the Soviet-Afghan initiatives is simple and clear: Armed or any other interference in Afghanistan should be ended fully and unconditionally, and guarantees against any interference in the future should be given. This, in the opinion of the Soviet Union and Afghanistan, is the primary condition of settling the situation around Afghanistan.

INDIA'S REDDY SENDS IN-FLIGHT MESSAGE TO BREZHNEV

PM141457 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Aug 81 p 2

[TASS report: "In-Flight Message"]

[Text] On a flight home from London, Neelam Sanjiva Reddy, president of the Republic of India, sent a telegram to Leonid Ilich Brezhnev. The telegram reads: "As once again I fly over the territory of the Soviet Union I wish to extend greetings and best wishes to you personally and to the friendly people of the Soviet Union and to express the hope that the friendly relations between our countries will continue to develop in the interests of our two countries and in the interests of peace."

COMMENTARY ON INDONESIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

BK161446 Moscow in Indonesian to Indonesia 1330 GMT 15 Aug 81

[Andrey Alekseyev commentary: "Welcoming Indonesian Independence Day"]

[Text] The Indonesian people will observe the 36th anniversary of the independence proclamation on 17 August. The red and white flag was hoisted over Indonesian soil 36 years ago as a symbol of the Indonesian people's victory in the long and difficult struggle against colonialism. The postindependence years, however, have proved to be no easy era, and the Indonesian people have repeatedly been called to arms to cope with neocolonialism. Nevertheless they succeeded in making certain achievements in development. In this connection, our commentator, Andrey Alekseyev, writes the following:

Since its birth, Indonesia has enjoyed strong support from international democratic forces and the socialist countries. The course taken by Indonesia to strengthen its national independence and accelerate economic growth and its policy of peace and friendship with all countries in the world have won the sympathy of the Soviet people. In the international arena, the Soviet Union has firmly supported the just Indonesian struggle against armed intervention by imperialist forces. It welcomed the outcome of the Afro-Asian conference in Bandung, Indonesia, which gave strong impetus to the struggle for peace and national liberation of people throughout the world.

Our two countries have had many positive experiences in the economic cooperation sector and in the training of Indonesian national cadres. The Senayan Sports Stadium in Jakarta, in which many athletic records have been broken and which can accommodate 100,000 spectators, was built with the assistance of Soviet experts. Cooperation between our two countries has bright prospects. This was clearly reflected in the Soviet trade and industrial exhibition in Jakarta in Spring 1979, which drew a great deal of interest in Indonesian business circles. Machinery, automobiles and light industrial products--in fact all the commodities exhibited--clearly and concretely indicated growing cooperation, giving the Indonesian trade and cooperative affairs minister, Radius Prawiro, every reason to say that the exhibition would further strengthen Indonesian-Soviet relations.

In the past as well as in the present, the course of developing friendship and cooperation has always been foremost in Indonesian-Soviet relations. In his cabled message congratulating Suharto on his reelection to the presidency in 1978, Leonid Brezhnev hoped that friendly relations between the two countries would in the future further develop for the benefit of the Soviet and Indonesian peoples as well as for world peace. The Soviet stand was reaffirmed at the highest forum of Soviet communists in February this year. We do not see any obstacles to improving cooperation with Indonesia as well as other ASEAN countries, Leonid Brezhnev said in a general report to the 26th CPSU Congress.

However, there are forces which are seeking to divert Indonesia from the course of developing relations with socialist countries and turn it into a tool of anti-Sovietism in Southeast Asia. Washington and Beijing want to use Indonesia's prestige, actions in support of disarmament and participation in the Nonaligned Movement for their own purposes. Besides seeking to draw Indonesia into the global imperialist bloc system, they also do not permit the existence of normal relations between Indonesia and the Indochinese countries, such as Kampuchea. It has been historically proven that such a course is absolutely contradictory to Indonesia's own national interests.

This is the very subject touched upon by an Indonesian newspaper, BERITA YUDHA, in connection with the 15th anniversary of the signing of the Jakarta agreement which brought an end to the confrontation between Indonesia and Malaysia.

As the newspaper says, the confrontation with a neighboring country was launched by Indonesia as a result of direct pressure from China which, for its own sake, was increasing tension in Southeast Asia and turning the region into an arena of international conflict. The 15 years of historical experience has proved that in the mutual relationship between neighboring countries, there is no problem which cannot be solved through peaceful negotiation. BERITA YUDHA further says: Hopefully, the positive experience will serve Southeast Asian countries as an example of a constructive approach to solving current regional problems. The public at large in Indonesia is calling for such an approach in determining Indonesia's foreign policy. Only such a kind of peace and cooperation can serve as the basis for a steady development of the national economy and liberation from the indiscriminate foreign economic domination and imperialist enslavement that Western countries want to impose on Indonesia. Indonesia is determined to pursue an independent and active foreign policy. The practice of such policy is expected to help to solve domestic problems and contribute to the strengthening of the ideals of peace and friendship throughout the world.

GROMYKO CONGRATULATES MALAYSIAN COUNTERPART

PM140849 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Aug 81 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report from V. Pshenkin's roundup "The Day Worldwide": "Exchange of Telegrams"]

[Text] USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Gromyko has sent a telegram to Ghazali Bin Shafie congratulating him on his appointment to the post of Malaysian foreign minister. In a reply telegram Ghazali Bin Shafie expressed thanks for the congratulations.

LAO PRIME MINISTER ARRIVES IN SOVIET UNION

LD121554 Moscow TASS in English 1544 GMT 12 Aug 81

[Text] Moscow, 13 Aug [date as received], TASS--General Secretary of the People's Revolutionary Party of Laos, Prime Minister of the Lao People's Democratic Republic Kaysone Phomvihan arrived for rest in the Soviet Union today at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

KALININ REPORTS ON USSR IMPORTS OF THAI RICE

PM130819 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jul p 4

[Correspondent V. Kalinin dispatch: "Reliable Partner"]

[Text] Bangkok, 30 Jul--In the first 6 months of this year Thailand's earnings from its rice exports have reached the record level of 15,613,700,000 bahts, Commerce Minister Chuan Likphai has announced. According to Commerce Ministry figures about 50 countries are purchasing Thai rice, the largest buyer being the Soviet Union. Local business circles are noting that the USSR is a reliable trading partner.

BRIEFS

SRV WATER DELEGATION--An SRV water conservancy delegation, made up of cadres and scientists and led by Prof Nguyen Van Cung, vice water conservancy minister, has just completed a 1-week visit to the Georgian SSR in the Caucasus. The Vietnamese guests learned from experiences in cultivating soil with excess moisture. They also visited the Soviet Institute for Research on Land Reclamation and Water Resources and held discussions with Soviet colleagues on draining and reclaiming the (Kurkhida) swampy region where 20 cooperatives have been formed on reclaimed land to cultivate tea and citrus. The Vietnamese delegation also visited the Soviet Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, where Soviet specialists heard Prof Nguyen Van Cung's report on development of agricultural production in Vietnam. [Moscow in Vietnamese to Vietnam 1000 GMT 12 Aug 81 OW]

COMMUNIQUE, REPORT ON SOVIET-POLISH TALKS

Communique Issued

LD151936 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 15 Aug 81

[Text of communique on the results of the meeting in the Crimea between Leonid Ilich Brezhnev and Stanislaw Kania, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, and Wojciech Jaruzelski, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the Council of Ministers and defense minister of Poland]

[Text] The General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, President of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Leonid Brezhnev met in the Crimea on 14 August with First Secretary of the PZPR Central Committee Stanislaw Kania and member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo, Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Defense Minister of the Polish People's Republic Wojciech Jaruzelski.

Taking part in the conversation were member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko; member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo; Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Konstantin Chernenko; Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Konstantin Rusakov; and aide to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoliy Blatov.

The first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish People's Republic Council of Ministers spoke about the problems on whose solution the PZPR is working in the light of the results of its ninth extraordinary congress. They stressed that the congress had called for the preservation and strengthening of the Marxist-Leninist principles of the party's activity, consolidation of its leading role in society, restoration and development of ties with the working class and the working people, outlining of the trends of the development of socialist democracy, of the consolidation of the socialist state and stabilization of the economic situation. The party has shown its initiative by working out the all-round program for overcoming the crisis. This was confirmed by the second plenary meeting of the PZPR Central Committee that was held on 11 August.

The program line set out by the ninth congress has met with the ever wider support of millions of the working people. However, the situation in the country remains very complex and difficult. The industrial output and national income are decreasing. There are considerable shortcomings in supplies to the population.

All this is the consequence not only of past mistakes but also of various subversive actions by the forces hostile to socialism. These forces seek to aggravate the difficulties and use them against the party and the people's power. Strikes and demonstrations that were held in the recent weeks, as well as numerous acts of antistate and anti-Soviet propaganda create a serious threat to the security of the state and its independence, to the vital interests of the Polish people.

In these conditions the PZPR and the Government of the Polish People's Republic see their priority task in pooling all the patriotic forces for the sake of national salvation for the motherland, averting a profound crisis, establishing the normal functioning of the entire national economy, putting up a barrier to the manifestations of anarchy in the aims of the resolute struggle against the threat of counterrevolution. All this must ensure the development of socialist Poland and its strengthening as a firm link of the socialist community of states and peoples.

Leonid Brezhnev stressed that the Soviet communists, all the Soviet people follow with close attention the events in the Polish People's Republic. The Soviet Union holds a consistent internationalist stand with regard to socialist Poland, wishes that the Polish communists and the entire fraternal Polish people should be implementing successfully the decisions of the ninth party congress aimed at the strengthening of the PZPR as a Marxist-Leninist party and the consolidation of socialism in the country.

It is not accidental that the external and internal enemies of socialism in Poland resort to anti-Sovietism. They hope to dig a trench between People's Poland and the Soviet Union and Poland's other reliable friends and allies, to undermine the foundations of peaceful, safe development of the independent Polish state.

The participants in the conversation unanimously hold that Soviet-Polish friendship, tempered in the crucible of the most rigorous trials of World War II, sealed with the blood spilled by Soviet and Polish soldiers, friendship that proved its constructive force during the entire postwar development, represents a great asset for the Soviet and Polish peoples.

The existence of a strong, sovereign socialist Poland meets the interests of the Soviet Union, just as the might and the high international prestige of the Soviet Union meet the interests of People's Poland.

Friendship between the two countries is confirmed anew in the hour of trial for Poland. The CPSU and all Soviet people solidarize sincerely with the PZPR and those forces of the Polish people that are exerting efforts to frustrate the designs of the enemies of socialism, to overcome the crisis and achieve the improvement of the living conditions of the people.

The problems of the development of broad, all-round cooperation between the two countries were discussed.

In view of the difficult economic situation of the Polish People's Republic, the Soviet Union is giving it considerable material assistance. It has been decided at present to defer the payment of Poland's debts to the Soviet Union to the next 5-year period, to supply additional raw materials for light industry and certain consumer goods. The Soviet Union will facilitate a more comprehensive utilization of Poland's industrial potential. The leadership of the party and the Government of the Polish People's Republic express sincere gratitude for this fraternal assistance.

Both sides stressed that Soviet-Polish friendship is one of the cornerstones of the present balance of forces in Europe.

The emergence and development of socialist Poland largely promoted the improvement of the situation on the continent. Major initiatives that began the process of the relaxation of international tension are connected with joint foreign policy actions of the USSR, the Polish People's Republic and other states, participants in the Warsaw Pact. The Soviet Union and Poland are determined to continue doing everything necessary for the strengthening of the socialist community, the bulwark of security and peace in Europe and all over the world.

The participants in the conversation noted that the forces of world imperialism, trying to hamper social progress, are conducting a dangerous policy of militarization and exacerbating the threat to peace by their activities on the international scene.

There are obvious attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of socialist states. This is the only way to view the recent resolution of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress concerning the domestic situation in Poland. The Soviet Union wholly supports the stand taken by the Polish People's Republic on this issue. These acts of interference in the affairs of other states introduce new complications into the present-day, tense international situation.

The constant heightening of tension, the unrestrained arms race--this is what imperialism tries to impose on humanity. Such a policy contradicts the interest of all peoples.

The participants in the meeting expressed the mutual readiness of the Soviet Union and Poland to continue advancing along the road of all-round development of Soviet-Polish cooperation and of the implementation of the joint peaceful, principled line in international affairs.

The meeting passed in an atmosphere of fraternal friendship and comradely mutual understanding.

Kania, Jaruzelski Depart

LD151026 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1015 GMT 15 Aug 81

[Text] Simferopol, 15 Aug (TASS)--Stanislaw Kania, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and Wojciech Jaruzelski, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the Council of Ministers and minister of national defense, today left the Crimea for home. They were in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee on a friendly visit. At the airport they were seen off by Andrey Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, Konstantin Rusakov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and other officials.

COMMENTATOR VIEWS BERLIN WALL ANNIVERSARY

DW140859 Moscow in German to Germany 1641 GMT 11 Aug 81

[Vladimir Ostrogorskiy commentary]

[Text] Esteemed listeners, 20 years ago on 13 August 1961, the GDR's border with West Berlin was strengthened. Here is a commentary on this anniversary by Vladimir Ostrogorskiy:

It is true that the significance of a historic event is recognized fully only after quite some time has passed. This is also what has happened with regard to the event of 13 August 1961. It was only after some time that the full significance became completely clear. It has become clear what is of lasting value and what--though dramatized at first in the West--falls into oblivion.

As is known, the immediate effect of a controlled functioning along the GDR's border with West Berlin resulted in an end to any abuses by the militant circles of the FRG and the Western powers. The cheapest atomic bomb of the West was defused, NATO's spearhead was countered with a reliable shield and the springboard was withdrawn from under the feet of the travelers to the East [ostlandfahrer].

Thus 13 August 1961 became the day of total defeat for those circles in the West which for many years had been seeking to destabilize the GDR from West Berlin and which had made use of all available means to achieve this end: economic diversion and political provocations, subversive activities and psychological warfare, and enticement and terror.

If one keeps in mind that at the end of the long campaign against the sovereign socialist German state an action by NATO's armed forces was planned, then one understands that the fortification of the most troublesome and dangerous border in central Europe--which was agreed to by the GDR, the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states, and was carried out with precision--has preserved peace on our continent. But by no means was this the only aftereffect on developments in Europe.

This is more evident today than ever before. The consistent and courageous rebuff dealt to the militant forces of the West has strengthened the position of the realistically-minded quarters. In the Western establishment--even for a long time they were not aware of it.

It can be said today that if on 13 August 1961 the limits of NATO's range of operation had not been clearly and distinctly demonstrated, then many things promoting a peaceful and secure life--the treaties with the East and the Helsinki Final Act, for example--would not exist for the peoples of the continent, not least of all for the people of the FRG.

Viewed from the social-political angle, there are also developments connected with this milestone in European postwar history which are of great significance for progress on our continent. It was only after the forced suspension of massive Western interference from West Berlin that the socialist social order and, above all, the economy of the GDR was in a position to fully prove its advantages and to develop all its potentials. Finally, it also brought its influence to bear on the shape of internal conditions in the Federal Republic where the ruling class must take into account what is happening east of the Elbe River if it does not want to give rise to any acute aggravation of social contradictions in its own country.

Although there is no doubt that the fortification of the GDR's border with West Berlin had an extremely positive effect in the political and social spheres, it was also accompanied by a number of human hardships, which were inevitable at the time. As a part of its basis, however, the measure taken by the socialist countries also included the possibility of overcoming these hardships later on. This occurred when 10 years later, in September 1971, the Quadripartite Agreement on West Berlin was signed, an agreement which--if strictly abided by and fully applied--provides the prerequisites for West Berlin never becoming a hotbed of conflict or a source of international tension.

Indeed, the postwar history of our continent, including the events and developments in and around West Berlin, is full of valuable experiences. It is only regrettable that certain quarters in the West do not take heed these experiences and do not accept these lessons. In their contest with the socialist world, they time and again resort to the very methods which were shown to fail miserably on 13 August 1961. This is what happened in Czechoslovakia until August 1968 and this is what is now happening in Poland where the sound social forces are rejecting and denouncing the West's interference.

The socialist countries are confronting the various imperialist diversionary activities not only with the necessary protective measures but also with a comprehensive and substantive detente program and with an honest offer for peaceful coexistence. We are glad that this program and this offer are making ever new friends everywhere, including the FRG and West Berlin.

ALIYEV RECEIVES HUNGARIAN FARMING COMBINE CHIEF

PM141502 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 28 Jul 81 p 1

[AZERINFORM report: "Reception at Azerbaijan CP Central Committee"]

[Excerpts] On 27 July G.A. Aliyev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Azerbaijan CP Central Committee, received Robert Burgert, MSZMP Central Committee member and general director of Hungary's Babolna agricultural combine, who is visiting our country at the CPSU Central Committee's invitation.

After expressing satisfaction at Comrade R. Burgert's visit to Azerbaijan, G.A. Aliyev spoke highly of the activity of the Babolna combine, headed by Burgert, and with which he became familiar during his visit to Hungary last year. Agroindustrial integration and high production efficiency have been achieved here, he said. This ensures the success of its work.

The Hungarian friends' valuable experience accumulated at this combine, and also on many questions of running the country's agriculture, are of great interest to us. We must acquire a greater and better knowledge of each other's successes, adopt everything valuable and progressive and introduce it at home. This, in turn, Comrade Aliyev noted, helps not only to intensify our economic ties but also, and this is particularly important, to consolidate the friendship and unity of the Soviet and Hungarian peoples in the name of further strengthening the entire socialist community. He stressed the tremendous contribution made to the cause of strengthening fraternal ties between the USSR and Hungary and between the CPSU and the MSZMP by Comrades L.I. Brezhnev and Janos Kadar personally.

Comrade Aliyev described the great successes achieved in the republic's agricultural production during the seventies, the prospects for further developing it in the present 5-year period and the work of the republic's party organization in implementing the 26th CPSU Congress decisions in the agricultural sphere.

The talk also touched on questions raised by the planned construction in Azerbaijan of a major poultry farm which will be carried out by the Babolna combine.

Taking part in the talk were I.A. Mamedov, Azerbaijan CP Central Committee secretary, and Sh. A. Rasizade, deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers.

TRADE WITH WEST EUROPE BASED ON POLITICAL REALISM

LD141700 Moscow TASS in English 1611 GMT 14 Aug 81

["In the Interests of European Cooperation"]

[Text] Moscow, 14 Aug, TASS--The results of development of the Soviet Union's foreign trade in the first half of the current year show that West European countries are, as before, the USSR's leading trade partners among industrial capitalist states. Statistical data just published show that five leading West European countries (FRG, Finland, France, Italy and Britain) account for almost two-thirds of the USSR's trade with capitalist states. This is the result not only of geographical proximity of the given countries (the economies of those countries and the economy of the Soviet Union supplement each other); of major significance is also political realism displayed by many statesmen and representatives of industrial-financial circles interested in further deepening of mutually-beneficial business contacts with Soviet economic organisations.

The FRG is a major trade partner of the Soviet Union. Trade with that country in the first half of the current year increased almost to 2,700 million roubles, as against 2,600 million roubles in the first half of last year.

Finland continues to be the USSR's second important trade partner. In the current year mutual commodity deliveries amounted to 2,400 million roubles, as against 1,600 million roubles in the first half of 1980. This growth is owing mainly to a sharp rise in Soviet purchases of Finnish products. France is in third place, as in last year; trade with that country increased in the current year up to more than 2,000 million roubles, as against 1,800 million roubles in the first half of last year. Fourth this year is Japan which left behind Italy, which moved down to fifth place. Its trade with the USSR in the current year amounted to almost 1,600 million roubles. Italy is followed by Britain; commodity exchange with that country amounted to about 1,000 million roubles in the first half of 1981.

FRG JOURNAL CITED ON USSR-FRG ECONOMIC LINKS

LD150101 Moscow TASS in English 2000 GMT 14 Aug 81

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Sosnovsky]

[Text] Moscow, 14 Aug, TASS--Representatives of the West German businessworld declare for the development of mutually advantageous commercial and economic relations between the FRG and the USSR, against the attempts of the United States to bring pressure on the business circles of the FRG and to prevent them from cooperating with their partners in the Soviet Union. The special issue of the economic journal BONNER ENERGIE-REPORT attests specifically to this. This issue is devoted to the planned Soviet-West German deal under which large-diameter pipes will be supplied by the FRG to the USSR in return for natural gas. As is known, this planned deal is fiercely attacked by Washington that tries in vain to convince the West German side that it will become economically dependent on the USSR, which will damage the West's interests. Highly assessing the USSR's energy and gas economy, the journal raised in its leading article the question why the United States is so alarmed by the deliveries of Soviet natural gas to the FRG. The FRG has long since been receiving natural gas from Siberia, and the planned deal would be the development of the agreements concluded earlier. Pointing out that West German energetics is interested in the deliveries of natural gas from the USSR, the journal warns that if the FRG yields to the pressure from across the Atlantic, it might remain empty-handed and the profitable order will be secured by competitors abroad. The journal quotes FRG Minister of Economics Otto Lambsdorff as saying that those who wish that the East-West trade exchange be balanced cannot declare against the increase of Soviet deliveries of natural gas to Europe. One of the heads of the concern Ruhrgas, K. Liesen, the chairman of the board of the AEG Telefunken concern, G. Durr and a number of other prominent representatives of the business circles contributed their statements to the journal, declaring in favour of the development of commercial and economic relations between the FRG and the USSR.

SKACHKOV MEETS WITH NIGERIAN STEEL MINISTER

PM140848 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Jul 81 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report]

[Text] On 30 July S.A. Skachkov, chairman of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, had talks with M. Makele, Nigerian federal minister of steel development, during which questions of Soviet-Nigerian cooperation in constructing the metallurgical plant at Ajaokuta were discussed.

GUINEA PARTY DELEGATION ARRIVES FOR USSR VISIT

PM141028 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Aug 81 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Arrival in Moscow"]

[Text] At the invitation of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, a delegation of Guinea peace supporters headed by Abdoulaye Diallo, member of the Democratic Party of Guinea Central Committee Politburo, arrived in Moscow on 3 August.

The delegation was greeted at the airport by executives of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace and Pierre Bassamba Camara, ambassador of the Revolutionary People's Republic of Guinea in the USSR.

GUINEA REPUBLIC AMBASSADOR PRESENTS CREDENTIALS

PM140846 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Aug 81 p 4

[Text] TASS--Pierre Bassamba Camara, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Revolutionary People's Republic of Guinea, presented his credentials to V.V. Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, in the Kremlin 6 Aug.

The ambassador was accompanied by embassy diplomatic aides.

After the presentation of credentials and an exchange of speeches there was a friendly talk between V.V. Kuznetsov and P.B. Camara in which L.F. Ilichev, USSR deputy foreign minister, and V.G. Vysotin, chief of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium International Relations Department participated.

COOPERATION PROTOCOL SIGNED WITH MADAGASCAR

PM131335 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Jul 81 Morning Edition p 4

[Text] Tananarive, TASS--A protocol on economic and technical cooperation between the USSR and the Democratic Republic of Madagascar has been signed in Tananarive. Under its terms the Soviet side will carry out geological prospecting in the Democratic Republic of Madagascar and give Madagascar assistance in developing the veterinary service and setting up an experimental grain farm in the region of Antisirabe and an agricultural equipment repair station.

The protocol and other documents were signed at the end of a session of the Soviet-Madagascar intergovernmental commission on economic and technical cooperation and trade. The participants in the meeting discussed specific ways to further develop bilateral cooperation in various spheres.

CPSU ADOPTS DECISION ON MONITORING PERFORMANCE

LD151410 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 15 Aug 81

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee has adopted a decision on the further improvement of monitoring and checking performance [ispolneniye] in the light of the 26th CPSU Congress decisions.

The successful solution of tasks in the field of domestic and foreign policy proposed by the 26th party congress, notes the decision, calls for an increase in the efficiency of party leadership and for an improvement in party organizations' workstyle and methods. In this connection the need is growing for a further improvement of monitoring and checking performance as a most important component of the party's organizational work.

Vladimir Ilich Lenin considered the correct organization of control to be an indispensable condition of socialist transformations. In the organization of monitoring and checking performance, the party is invariably guided by very important Leninist principles such as mass character, effectiveness and publicity. Lenin's ideas and tenets concerning the organization of control have been creatively developed in the documents of party congresses, plenary sessions of the Central Committee, and the works of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev.

In recent years the CPSU Central Committee has given increased attention to checking implementation of decisions that have been adopted. In accordance with the new USSR Constitution, important measures are being carried out in the country to improve the work of all control organs. The adoption of the law on people's control in the USSR was of great significance. At the same time, the CPSU Central Committee considers that the level of monitoring and checking performance does not fully meet the directives of the 26th CPSU Congress.

The CPSU Central Committee has recommended Central Committee's of communist parties of union republics, kraykoms, obkoms, okruzhkoms, gorkoms, raykoms of the party, and primary party organizations, on the basis of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, and the directives of Comrade Brezhnev, to ensure a further rise in the level of organizational work, an intensification of monitoring and checking performance and an improvement of their forms and methods.

Monitoring and checking performance, says the decision, must be a most important component of the day-to-day organizational work of any link in the party and state apparatus, of every party, soviet and public leader, of all party organizations. The text of the decision will be published in the press.

PETROLEUM MINISTER MALTSEV VISITS AZERBAIJAN

PM141454 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 30 Jul 81 p 1

[AZERINFORM report: "Comrade N.A. Maltsev's Visit to Azerbaijan"]

[Excerpts] Comrade N.A. Maltsev, USSR minister of the petroleum industry, visited the republic 27-30 July. He met with leaders of the Azneft association, oil and gas extracting and drilling administrations, construction and other enterprises and scientific research organizations and production pacemakers and familiarized himself with the state of oil and gas extraction, geological prospecting anddrilling work.

Questions of further developing the extraction of oil in the Azneft association were discussed in detail and there was a broad exchange of opinions in the light of the 26th CPSU Congress and 30th Azerbaijan CP Congress decisions at a conference of the association's party economic aktiv. The existence of much potential and unused reserves for oil and gas extraction in the republic was pointed out and the task was set of considerably increasing volume and improving the technical-economic indicators of drilling work, improving the process of exploiting deposits and expanding the use of secondary and tertiary methods for intensifying extraction with the aim of the maximum extraction of remaining stocks of oil.

There was a talk between Comrade G.A. Aliyev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Azerbaijan CP Central Committee, and N.A. Maltsev at the Azerbaijan CP Central Committee on 29 July. There was an examination of the prospects for developing oil extraction in the Azneft association and questions connected with retooling the sector, raising the standard of production at oilfields, improving oil workers' working and living conditions, stepping up the material and technical equipping of enterprises and ensuring the fulfillment of the 1981 plans and the 11th 5-Year Plan as a whole.

Accompanying Comrade Maltsev at the oil industry enterprises were G.N. Seidov, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers; K.M. Bagirov, Azerbaijan CP Central Committee secretary; S.B. Tatliyev, first deputy chairman of the Azerbiajan Council of Ministers; V.I. Igrevskiy, USSR first deputy minister of the petroleum industry; and B.A. Gadzhiyev, Azneft association general director.

REPORT ON ARMENIAN CENTRAL COMMITTEE PLENUM

PM141349 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 25 Jul 81 p 1

[Unattributed "Information Report on Armenian CP Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] A routine Armentian CP Central Committee plenum was held on 24 July 1981.

The plenum discussed the question "of the tasks of the republic's party organization in further increasing the production and improving the quality of fodder in the light of the 26th CPSU Congress decisions and the instructions of Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on these questions."

A report was delivered by Comrade K.S. Demirchyan, first secretary of the Armenian CP Central Committee.

Taking part in the debate on the report were Comrade G.R. Barikyan, first secretary of Abovyanskiy Raykom; Comrade V.I. Shubin, worker at the Razdan Armgoskomselkhoztekhnika" association; Comrade M.L. Mkrtchyan, first secretary of Akhuryanskiy Raykom; Comrade V.A. Ambartsumyan, milkmaids' team leader on the Kechutskiy Sovkhoz, Azizbekovskiy Rayon; G.D. Sagoyan, Armenian SSR first deputy minister of agriculture; Comrade V.B. Voskanyan, director of the Scientific Research Institute of Livestock Raising and Fodder Production; Shch.B. Davtyan, first secretary of Sisianskiy Raykom; Comrade S.S. Oganesyan, chairman of the Armenian SSR Goskomselkhoztekhnika; Comrade Sh.A. Aleksanyan, first secretary of Gukasyanskiy Raykom; Comrade M.G. Gevorkyan, chief of the Glavarmvodstroy; and Comrade A.A. Daniyelyan, director of the Artsvashen Village Sovkhoz in Krasnoselskiy Rayon.

The Central Committee plenum adopted an appropriate resolution on the question discussed.

The plenum also discussed the question "of progress in fulfilling communists' critical observations and proposals put forward at report and election meetings of primary party organizations, rayon and city party conferences and the 27th Armenian CP Congress."

A report was delivered by Comrade G.M. Voskanyan, secretary of the Armenian CP Central Committee.

Taking part in the debate on the report were Comrade R.A. Vartanyan, first secretary of Shaumyanskiy Raykom; Comrade I.A. Akopyan, worker at the Kirovakan lighting equipment plant; Comrade R.M. Galstyan, second secretary of Leninakan Gorkom; and team leader Comrade G.S. Markaryan, secretary of the party bureau at No 31 construction administration of the Yerpromstroy trust.

The plenum adopted an appropriate resolution on the question discussed.

A concluding address was delivered at the plenum by Comrade K.S. Demirchyan, first secretary of the Armenian CP Central Committee.

The plenum appointed Comrade V.A. Megrabyan, chief of the Armenian CP Central Committee Industry Department; Comrade G.S. Ikilikyan chief of the Armenian CP Central Committee Trade and Consumer Services Department; and Comrade Yu. Ye. Khodzhamiryan, chief of the Armenian CP Central Committee Planning and Finance Organs Department.

Comrade D.G. Aliyev was appointed editor of the newspaper SOVET ERMANISTANY.

On this the Central Committee plenum finished work.

Taking part in the Armenian CP Central Committee plenum were Comrade V.Ye. Odintsov, sector chief in the CPSU Central Committee organizational work section; and Comrade N.M. Tishchenko, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Agricultural Section.

Demirchyan Address

PM141351 [Editorial Report] Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian on 25 July 1981 publishes on pages 1-3 a 15,000-word "abridged version" of the "Report of Comrade K.S. Demirchyan, first secretary of the Armenian CP Central Committee, at the Armenian CP Central Committee plenum on 24 July 1981," under the headline "Strengthening the Fodder Base Is a Key Task in Developing Livestock Raising." Demirchyan outlines fodder production targets in the republic, notes past successes and shortcomings and dwells at length on the necessary measures for improving the sector.

LAWYER OFFERS ADVICE TO POLITICAL TRIAL WITNESSES

PM140939 Paris LE MONDE in French 6 Aug 81 p 5

[Daniel Vernet dispatch: "Question of Logic"]

[Text] Moscow--"How To Be a Witness?" A Soviet national close to dissident circles has published a pamphlet on this subject and has been traveling through the USSR delivering private lectures with a view to explaining to citizens likely to be summoned some day as witnesses in a political trial how they should answer questions put to them by an examining magistrate.

Being a trained mathematician, he has devised a system based on both logic and a perfect knowledge of penal code procedure, and also on personal experience--he has been summoned dozens of times by the security organs, including several times by the KGB.

He advises people to show great respect for Soviet law which, he believes, offers many possibilities of defense to any person who is able to apply it literally, tell nothing but the truth and take the examining magistrate at his word when he asks questions and is endowed with a sense of humor.

When you receive a summons you should prepare yourself in advance, even if you do not know what questions will be put to you, in order to gain an idea of the direction in which you should orient any "dialogue" and be able to say two or three things which you believe are important. The main thing is to seek to convince the "organs," the mathematician states, that it would be pointless to interrogate you any further.

Another rule: You should pay great attention to what the magistrate says and point out any inaccuracy. It is also advisable to give answers likely to give rise to further questions for which you have prepared yourself. Example: "Do you know such and such an individual? --Unfortunately, I have not maintained close relations with him. Unavoidable question: Why 'unfortunately'?--Because if I had known him better, I could be more useful as far as the inquiry is concerned.

Whenever possible, replies should be tantamount to real questions, in such a way that the magistrate's questions are, in fact, replies to your replies. A question of logic!

Interrogation sessions which, as far as Moscow is concerned, take place at either Lefortovo Prison or the old Lubyanka, the KGB's Headquarters, go on, as a rule, for a very long time. On the average, for some 10 hours with a break for lunch. The first part merely serves to set the stage. It is in the second part that interrogation begins in earnest. The "dialogue" (question and answers) takes place in writing.

That mathematician has devised a system which he has called "PLOD" (fruit) derived from the Russian initials of four major principles which in French could be called "pire" [worse]:

"P" as in protocol--all questions must be mentioned in the protocol, otherwise the witness does not have to answer them;

"I" as in individual--questions must not suggest that the witness is, in fact, a potential accused, otherwise he can avail himslef of his right not to answer. In fact, it is current practice that people are summoned as witnesses and then charged on the basis of their statements;

"R" as in relation--questions must be directly related to the case in connection with which you have been summoned; and

"E" as in ethics--both question and answer must be "acceptable" from the moral viewpoint, otherwise you can refuse to answer.

To illustrate how his system operates, its author quotes a question regularly put to him at the end of his information meetings--"What should we say if we are summoned and requested to state what we were doing here tonight?" Answer: "We were, in fact, learning how to answer this question."

BRIEFS

EDUCATION IN KIRGIZ SSR--Over 50,000 students have been admitted into the dormitories of the Academy of Sciences and other educational institutions in the Kirgiz SSR for the current academic year. [Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 12 Aug 81 GF]

RADOV SERIES ON SHCHEKINO LABOR-SHARING EXPERIMENT

Part II

PM131535 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Jul 81 pp 2-3

[Second of Aleksandr Radov's "Letters From Shchekino": "Experiment's Paradoxes"]

[Text] Many times I have met economic leaders who frankly did not believe in the Shchekino method. Or they believed in the method's potential but refused categorically to introduce it. This is what Grigoriy Ivanovich Grotseskul, first secretary of Shchekino Gorkom, told me with some surprise: "The impression is--and there are examples of this--that the introduction of the Shchekino method is of more interest to the party than to the economic organs."

Sessions of a commission set up by the gorkom try to persuade enterprise directors by one means or another to adopt the method. But they stall and contend that they are not ready for it. Why is it that economic leaders have to be made almost by force or by applying party discipline to become innovators and take up something worthwhile?

Vasiliy Vladimirovich Semenov, chief of the Tulskiy Obkom metallurgical and chemical industry section, offered this opinion: "If you were to take a look at Tula in the early morning from a helicopter, you would notice the big Ikarusz buses speeding away in different directions from the center. They are going to collect people from the villages and housing estates and take them to work. This solution to the cadre problem seems the most advantageous to the economic leaders....

There is reason in these explanations. But how should the economic leaders' logic be understood? It is hard to believe that their main wish is to make life easy for themselves. And even if that were so, why would they prefer to make life easy for themselves by defending themselves against a progressive method rather than adopting it as an ally?

A short digression. Having been steeped in Shchekino material for almost a year, I am now convinced that the method is not simply a remedy for the cadre shortage, but a means of conducting any business economically and improving it right away in all areas. The Shchekino incentives encourage an enterprise to progress uninterruptedly along the path of intensification. The method really does make the leaders' life easier, because it helps to establish precise order and to support it by social control from below. It enables the difficult problems of leadership to be placed on many shoulders and allows scope for initiative and independent creative action, making them a necessity. Under the method's conditions, moral and professional qualities are formed in a few years which in normal conditions take decades....

So why do many people shy away from the Shchekino method, if it is so remarkable? I asked this question in the shop where Popov and Galiaskarov, whom we already know, work, and this was the collective answer:

"They're a little afraid.... When there are surplus people it's still more peaceful to work....

"With us, if one person doesn't turn up and another is on leave, that's it--we still don't replace the one that's missing...."

Who would argue? If there are surplus people, then there is room for maneuver and potential insurance. But why do economic considerations fade into the background in such cases? It turns out that it is more advantageous even in economic terms for an enterprise to have a surplus than a shortage of manpower. The enterprise's grade [razryad] is determined according to numbers. The more people there are, the bigger the wage fund and likewise also of the bonus resources.

The leaders' salary rates are directly dependent on the number of personnel, and not on the efficiency with which they are utilized.

The economist V.S. Nemchenko, for example, proposes the introduction of payment per workplace. This, he says, will change enterprises' irrational attitude to manpower, which can be obtained almost for free. But then, when payments for fixed capital were introduced, did capital really start to be utilized better from that time? It is the state that pays, not spendthrift administrators out of their own hard-earned money. Let us try to put ourselves in the position of our economic leaders. Imagine, there are constant difficulties in supply, plans are unstable, and calls on manpower for all kinds of urban and rural needs are inescapable. How is it possible to get around the situation without reserve supplies of manpower? How realistic are all these apprehensions?

Here are some sad stories from the Shchekino chemical combine's biography, which demonstrate all the obstacles which emerge in the way of the progressive method. Wherever I went in the chemical workers' settlement my gaze would fall on the strange skeleton of an uncompleted building. "This is our culture center," the old inhabitants explain. "The construction workers abandoned it 13 years ago...." At the edge of the settlement the abandoned frames of apartment blocks stand next to one another. At the same time workers of the greatest value to production are determining to leave Shchekino, despairing of ever receiving housing, and submitting their "clearance" applications ["begunki"]....

Funds honestly earned by the combine have been as if frozen for many years. "The construction workers do not have enough people." It is thought that nothing can be done about this. The Shchekino builders themselves have not released people; indeed they have swallowed up with unusual ease hundreds of workers donated to them by the city's enterprises which have transferred to the method. This is what happens when business partners live according to different economic laws. The builders did everything necessary for the city's other enterprises but were in no hurry for the chemical combine. The whole point is that other enterprises were assiduously sending hundreds of their own workers on decorating work. This is the strange order which has been established everywhere. But the chemical combine, although it has every wish to observe the old rules of the game, cannot do so since it literally has not one surplus person remaining. And because of this it is suffering. The combine has been receiving production premises only after an enormous delay. Why has the 5-year plan not been fulfilled? Largely because the combine could not "get round" the construction workers.

Is this all? Of course not.... When I was there the chairman of a kolkhoz under the combine's patronage came to the combine. His every phrase revealed the conviction that they were under obligation to him. He came to remind them that he was expecting 100 workers daily from the combine and also that a hostel must be built for them. The chiefs were not against it--the countryside must be given help. But the trouble was where to get the people from. And the kolkhoz was not the only enterprise under the combine's patronage. It had to send people to the brick plant, to build roads, to pick vegetables....

The ispolkoms handing out to the enterprises and establishments their required manpower totals neither wish to know nor are prepared to take into consideration how much each of them has cut down under the Shchekino method. Even the ministries, in informing each enterprise of its targets for the reduction of administrative and management personnel, are not always willing to consider whether or not they have released their surplus manpower. Thus it turns out that the enterprises which honestly apply the method suffer a great loss in comparison with those which have been more cautious....

According to the experiment's very meaning, not only the wage fund but all available social benefits must be shared among those remaining after the cuts. According to its logic, innovators should have been rewarded not only by higher wages but also by the best opportunities for housing, leisure, sporting activities and so on. But this did not happen. Largely because the business partners, chiefly the construction people, did not come up to scratch. And very soon its own ministry began to give the combine less than the funds it had earned, in order to transfer them to the laggard enterprises.

Every economic experiment is a two-sided contract. The combine kept its word but the other high contracting party did not fulfill it completely. Who precisely was involved here?

"The Shchekino method existed in its full, most effective variant only in the Eighth 5-Year Plan, and then only at the Shchekino chemical combine...."

This is what Vera Ivanovna Slepikh said to me. For many years she was chief economist, then deputy director of the chemical combine. This is her job, but in spirit she is a devotee, an ardent supporter of the method. For its introduction she won the USSR State Prize together with a group of like-minded people, and then she defended a candidate's dissertation on this theme. When obstacles arose in the method's way, she began to sound the alarm, applying to all the courts and entering into combat with all its overt and covert enemies. Nonetheless she could not hold out to the end--she left the combine. Now she is in Moscow. She has acquired a chair in a sector institute which trains production leaders. She publicizes her method from the institute chair. She always gets angry when she discovers that her audience has a distorted or false impression of both the method itself and its potential.

"We have achieved convincing results utilizing 20 percent of the method's potential"--her opinion is maybe too categorical, but she backs it up with references to the experience of using the Shchekino method in several CEMA countries.

I have tried to discover the borderline between the actual Shchekino method and modernizations of it. The instructions for the application of this conceptually very simple method have an infinite number of points and sub-points.

"The instructions are our undoing. Those that contradict both the spirit and the letter of the experiment. The instructions for the Shchekino method are such that it is difficult to comply with them"--this is how Academician Abel Gezevich Aganbegyan, the well-known economist, commented on the situation. "I do not know where it originates, but a definite distrust of economic leaders is making itself felt here. I could have understood this if it had happened during the early 5-year plans, when a lot of people without higher education came into enterprise leadership. But nowadays leaders are of quite a different standard, in both education and experience. Like, for example the Norilsk mining and metallurgical combine leaders. These are state people: For goodness' sake, each of them could have been a deputy minister or even a minister. Yet sometimes they are not entrusted with the solution of even the most trivial questions. For example, how much steel should be cast for auxiliary needs. What do they think they are going to do--cast too much?

Is not the position of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, whose specialists have so regulated the Shchekino method that there are fewer people willing to follow the innovators, to be explained by this mistrust? The 1965 reform recognized our management cadres to be fully prepared to manage independently. It was precisely then that the party began with particular consistency to follow a course of developing economic initiative in statewide interests. Practice confirmed the correctness of such a course.

Stanislav Nikolayevich Golubev is chief of the labor planning in industry subsection of the USSR Gosplan. He knows down to the smallest detail everything connected with the Shchekino method. In a conversation with me he acknowledged that the leaders of enterprises which transferred to the Shchekino method have generally spent the savings on wages left to the enterprise very zealously. And the whole spark that set the forest on fire over the method flared up just because of those savings. At the second stage of the Shchekino workers' experiment for example, almost R4 million were confiscated.

From that time the Shchekino movement was clearly on the slide. The Shchekino incentive ceased to be attractive.

It was only after several years that the limiting instruction was countermanded. In April 1978 a resolution was adopted by four central departments to revert to the original conditions of the Shchekino experiment. Many mistakes were corrected in it. Enterprises were again given the right to dispose of their wage fund savings themselves. However, it still did not succeed fully in restoring confidence in the Shchekino method. Economic leaders are being cautious. Largely because the economic conditions persist whereby the enterprise which honestly reveals its reserves turns out to lose by that. These conditions constitute an antiquated yet persisting economic mechanism. We must hope that its days are numbered. However, the inertia of economic thought about which Comrade L.I. Brezhnev spoke at the 26th party congress is still being maintained.

"A condition of adopting the Shchekino method," Academician Aganbegyan believes, "is that ministries and main administrations desist from interfering in enterprises' activity and altering indicators. Imagine, for example," the academician nodded at me, "that you are a main administration chief. You have 10 plants. You have transferred five of them to the Shchekino method, and five of them not. One or other of your plants is not fulfilling its plan. What do you do under normal circumstances? You transfer it [perebrasivayete].... But under the terms of the Shchekino method you cannot do that...."

In order to make this more understandable, Aganbegyan cites a specific example.

"I am very familiar with the experience of the Omsk petrochemical plant. The old enterprise was increasing labor productivity by 2 percent per year. Then, at the beginning of the Ninth 5-Year Plan, it was transferred to the Shchekino method, and in the 5 years it increased productivity right away by 48 percent. But all those years the ministry struggled against the Shchekino method at the enterprise. And in the end it won. At the beginning of the 10th 5-Year Plan the method was abolished at the plant, and now it is again producing increases of 2 percent a year. But the ministry is satisfied. Why? Because it can change the indicators every year...."

Is this occurrence unique? I am reading a letter, from a 33-year old, as he describes himself, technical control section chief Ye.G. Chapy: "I wish to share my thoughts about the Shchekino method. Everyone understands how useful and efficient it is. Yet there are still few places where it is adopted. I was astounded this summer when I learned that our higher authorities are forbidding our sectors' enterprises to adopt it. Why? They simply said: It is not permitted. I think that the point is that the leaders are afraid of making a mistake...."

And here a new plot begins to thicken in our story.

Series Ends

PM140825 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Jul 81 p 2

[Final part of Aleksandr Radov "Letters From Shchekino": "Experiment's Paradoxes"]

[Text] "Don't pester me with your method!" was the first thing the new Director Milentyev, who replaced the seriously ill Sharov, said to the combine's chief economist V.I. Slepykh. It was then that Vera Ivanovna started to think for the first time that she would have to leave the combine. And talk was running through the town that the Azot director was against the method which was born at the Azot....

On verification it transpired that everything was different. Nikolay Romanovich Milentyev, while he was still at the Novomoskovskiy Azot, whence he had come, had himself been a defender of Shchekino-style work. Here too, at the combine, he was prepared to support all the Shchekino traditions. But he discovered that the chemical combine was in deep trouble: to the extent that it had underfilled the year's plan by R19 million, although it had worked to the limit of its potential. So was Milentyev wrong in considering that all the combine's troubles were due to the fact that the Shchekino method did not yet fit into the existing economic situation? The collective worked far more intensively than others, yet it was rewarded worse than enterprises holding back their reserves. Here is an example: In 1976 the chemical combine ranked 17th in terms of wage levels among the 25 enterprises of Soyuzazot.

"At our neighbors," Milentyev recounts, "an instrument controlman receives R160 and services one unit. But at our combine for the same R160 he services three units. Why? When wage rates were fixed in 1975, for some reason they forgot that the Shchekino association is engaging in a method under which additional payments are laid down for people. As a result very many workers were deprived of these payments.

The leveling approach encourages parasitism and devalues incentives to stepped-up labor. Why, the directors argue, strain to achieve more if people still "clip your wings" and reduce you to a common denominator? Yet leveling sometimes arises from the most noble of motives--to help an unfortunate enterprise which has run into a hitch. But the result has been that for some time certain ministries have become particularly generous toward those who acknowledge their own helplessness, creating an impasse and forcing the leading workers to pay for it.

"Initially we shall go to the people and then we shall renovate the method," was what Milentyev intended. It transpired that the method was already inseparable from the combine. It had eaten into the system of the enterprises's work and into the mentality of its people's thinking. And then Milentyev formulated the task as follows: "Return the authority to the method!" And it was in this that he engaged, trying to show at all levels that he was not asking for anything extra but for something normal which by rights belongs to the combine and which it has earned. It emerged that everything was based not on the erroneous position of any individual leader in the ministry but on the ordinary practice of "planning from what has been achieved," which is fundamentally at variance with the Shchekino method.

"At the very start of the experiment," I was told by Vasiliy Mikhaylovich Suslyak, second secretary of Tulskiy Obkom, "we felt that the people at the combine did not trust us entirely. They told us that time would pass and they would again find themselves planned for 'from what has been achieved....' But we convinced them that this would not happen!"

Alas, everything reverted to what it had been before....

"They are manipulating the plans as they want," Vasiliy Mikhaylovich said in a heartfelt manner. "The plans of many of our enterprises are increased six or seven times a year. Surely we cannot work by the Shchekino method under such conditions?"

Who does not know how reshuffling the plan affects enterprises? Rush work and emergency operations arise and people and equipment are overstrained. it is impossible to work economically under such conditions. It is not worth the effort, as they say. It seems absurd to embark on something new, on any new method....

"Why are the plans changed so frequently?" I asked when I met Stanislav Nikolayevich Golubev, chief of the USSR Gosplan Political Department.

Stanislav Nikolayevich complained about the changeable situation in the economy, of the fact that you cannot see everything in advance, but he also gave the main reason--the cadre factor. His train of thought is as follows: There are many unskilled workers in the industrial associations and ministries. It is they, he says, who frequently resort to plan manipulations.

It is interesting that Vasiliy Mikhaylovich Suslyak also cited as a very serious obstacle in the Shchekino method's path the leaders who prefer ease in work, whereas the Shchekino method does not give an easy life...

"There is no time to be concerned for cadres...."

He thought for a moment in silence and then explained: "If you came and looked to see what the obkom secretary is working on, starting first thing in the morning, he distributes railcars, electricity and gas among enterprises of different departmental subordination, settles disputes and arguments....

"To whom can I turn now if some economic question has to be resolved on a regional scale," Vasiliy Mikhaylovich asked. "I must resolve it myself, because we have no horizontal economic structure...."

Vasiliy Mikhaylovich and I estimated how many workers would have been released had territorial collaboration between enterprises existed. If only along auxiliary production lines. "Perhaps," Vasily Mikhaylovich pondered, "a ministry should be created to serve all the other ministries? Or perhaps joint-stock societies and companies should be created with enterprises shares? They could produce instruments, repair machine tools, even give recommendations, for money, on the scientific organization of labor and management...."

He is right--the time has come. But without this, with every passing year the tendency toward payment in kind is intensified, with each enterprise trying to create an entire, self-sufficient [naturalnoye] economic facility in order to be dependent on no one. And since that is so it is in very great need of surplus, spare manpower, but it does not need the Shchekino method....

"Of course, we are also to blame," Vasiliy Mikhaylovich admitted. "When we send people to the countryside--and we are sending 8,000 machine operators alone--we do not consider who was effected a reduction, and of what size, under the method...."

Many obstacles are accumulating on the method's path. Sometimes there is no one to help an enterprise which has ventured to work economically. What can be done here? "I have the glimmer of an idea," Nikolay Romanovich Milentyev once said thoughtfully. "It is no longer new. The level at which the experiment is approved--that is the level at which the monitoring of its succcessful implementation should be carried out. But how have things turned out? Our experiment has been supported at a high level, yet this has not reached the level of the all-union association to which we are subordinate--that would mean that our experimental enterprise would be planned for under an individual heading."

I spent a long time talking about the same subject with Vera Ivanovna Slepykh and her former colleagues at the combine, Mokin, Yegorov and Lupanov. They are all now living and working in Moscow but frequently get together. They honestly admit that the time of the Shchekino experiment was the best of their lives. They describe those years with great emotion, and again I recalled Lev Tolstoy: "To live honestly you must strain, become confused, fight, make mistakes, begin something and reject it, reject it again, and struggle and do without constantly. Tranquility is spiritual baseness."

It is striking how many people--both those I have named and those I have not--believed in the method and its great potential for transforming, and gave it their efforts, knowledge and spiritual passion. What motivated them? How are we to understand these motives, which usually lie so deep? The social and moral roots of the innovative outlook are a separate subject and are almost never touched on by journalists and writers.

And there is one more separate layer to the Shchekino experience--how did the innovators succeed in carrying out so skillfully, so flexibly and with such a high degree of organizational maturity the very complex task of elaborating and introducing the method? What executive science have they erected for themselves? Let us not overlook the fact that the actual method of introducing the method is a very valuable possession. A real capital which our numerous enthusiasts and innovators sometimes lack. . . .

Nonetheless, our innovators are still highly dissatisfied. They would so much like the method to work everywhere, not only in industry but also in agriculture, the services sphere and the management field. They believe that there is evidence to deny the universal applicability of their method.

"In general," Vera Ivanovna asserts, "if you approach this measure in a state manner, it would be right to allow the collective to continue revealing reserves, so that it can fulfill increasingly crucial tasks with fewer and fewer people. . . . After all, Vladimir Ilich Lenin once said that model enterprises must be created. . . . We would like to turn the Shchekino chemical combine into such a model enterprise, so that everyone seeing it wants to emulate its experiment. . . ."

Social emulation is the best way of disseminating useful experience, but we use it extremely rarely. Yet we have quite a number of enterprises laying claim to the status of a model enterprise--the Volga truck plant, the Likhachev truck plant, the Krasnyy Proletarity, the Kaluga turbine plant. . . . Are special efforts needed for them? No, indeed. They only need normal efforts. Whereby they are guaranteed to receive all that they earn.

It was here that we reached a difficult question. The point is that the Shchekino chemical combine has linked its destiny most dramatically with Tolstoy's Yasnaya Polyana, which is nearby, just 3 km away. At one time, before the start of the renowned experiment, atmospheric waste from the combine was damaging the Tolstoy estate. To ensure that this was not repeated, the combine was obliged to procure powerful purifying equipment and was forbidden to expand production. This alone put the combine in a difficult position, since the economic and indeed social welfare of any enterprise depends directly on increasing production volumes. Even when this is not very expedient. The logic of the Shchekino experiment also demanded, after all, an increase in volume. Everything was being produced on old equipment because the combine was not allowed to install new, high-capacity equipment. And although the combine now spends many millions on protection of the atmosphere and the water courses and engages in preventive work--it maintains its own laboratory in Yasnaya Polyana village--the danger of accidental pollution increases as the equipment wears out. Here fundamental decisions are needed which will help to ensure the safety of a pearl of our culture--Yasnaya Polyana--but will also preserve for us what is after all also a priceless possession, namely the trail-blazing collective.

There have been tentative plans to move the combine or essentially to reconstruct it on a new site and consequently to reconstruct the city around it or, leaving it on its present territory, to supply the most modern equipment fully guaranteeing the safety of the environment. The collective itself is militating for the second option. The combine in conjunction with the planning institute has produced its reasons and sent them to higher authority, but there is still no decision. And the combine's future is in doubt because of this, hence many people's uncertainty and the attempts to find their long-term future elsewhere. Surely the method's prestige suffers from this? Yet it depends closely on the combine's prestige and prosperity.

But perhaps the method's time is past, and mention of it is of purely academic interest and no more?

"The cadre shortage we have today is just the beginning. It will multiply in the future.... That means that we are quite unable to manage without the Shchekino method!"--that is the opinion of Stanislav Nikolayevich Golubev, chief of the USSR Gosplan Subdepartment for Labor Planning in Industry.

"The method's time has not passed, it is only just beginning"--that is the common ground, so to speak, of my numerous interlocutors' statements. And since that is so, that means that we must take up arms to do battle. The method must be purged of all erroneous elements attached to it by chance and must be enriched with all the valuable things which the trail-blazers have discovered. And the method must be assured of real state support. To ensure that its future is not determined by narrow departmental interests, however mutual they may be, but by nationwide interests. And a new management mechanism, without which it is impossible to surmount obsolete stereotypes in economic thinking, must start operating as soon as possible....

"So should we fly or should we wait for the swallows to arrive?" I asked Nikolay Romanovich Milentyev, reminding him of Lev Tolstoy's words.

"Fly, of course!" Nikolay Romanovich replied confidently. "After all, each swallow brings the summer closer. Today there is no doubt that the Shchekino method is the main avenue. And even the misfortunes the combine has suffered are, after all, also experience, also a lesson! If our first swallow had not flown, then today we would have to begin at the beginning, in 1967, and after all it is 1981 now...."

DOLGIKH ADDRESSES GAS INDUSTRY CONFERENCE

LD141546 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 14 Aug 81

[Text] At the CPSU Central Committee today a conference has been held on matters of intensifying economic, organizational and political work connected with the fulfillment of the decision of the 26th CPSU Congress and Comrade Brezhnev's instructions on accelerating the development of the gas industry and tasks in constructing gas transport systems. Serious attention was paid to the need for implementing practical measures to ensure high rates of development of the gas industry in West Siberia, to improve the quality of construction and timely deliveries of cargo to the northern areas, to the creation of proper conditions for working people at work and home.

A report was delivered at the conference by Dolgikh, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

BRIEFS

OIL EXTRACTION--Since the beginning of the year Tyumen oil workers have extracted 200 million tons of oil, more than 1 million tons above plan. In this first year of the new 5-year plan, 610 million tons of oil and gas condensate will be extracted in the USSR. Western Siberia remains the main area for this, and is responsible for extracting more than one-half of the entire amount planned. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 16 Aug 81 LD]

RSFSR CSA OFFICIAL REPORTS HARVESTING STATISTICS

LD150348 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 14 Aug 81

[Text] The RSFSR Central Statistical Administration reports that the republic's kolkhozes and sovkhozes have cut natural and sown grasses on an area of 31,124,000 hectares, which is 80 percent of the plan. A total of 23,902,000 tons of hay has been stored; this is almost 50 percent more than had been laid in by this time last year. Commenting on these figures, Ivan Prokofyevich Mulukh, deputy head of the Main Fodder Directorate of the RSFSR Ministry of Agriculture, stressed that the farms of the northwestern part of Russia--Arkhangelskaya, Vologodskaya and Novgorodskaya Oblasts and the Karelskaya ASSR--had worked especially well. However, the gathering in of straw is again proceeding unsatisfactory. To date only 11 million tons out of the planned 54 million tons have been stored. Very little of this fodder has been prepared by the farms of the Chuvashskaya ASSR, Astrakhanskaya and Kurganskaya Oblasts and Altayskiy Kray.

RADIO REPORTS AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS 14-16 AUG

LD170047 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 14, 15, and 16 August. Times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item:

14 August

Two-thirds of the area allocated to winter crops has been sown to date in Udmurtskaya ASSR. Chemical fertilizer is being applied at the same time the seeds are sown. This will help obtain a good crop of rye, the main food crop on the local non-chernozem soil. (0204 GMT)

Cereals have been cleared from 900,000 hectares in Ryazanskaya Oblast. That is three-fourths of the entire grain area. (0400 GMT)

About 1 million hectares of cereal crops are to be harvested in virgin land areas of Orenburgskaya Oblast, where the harvest has started. The dry and hot summer has caused grain to ripen earlier in Arkhangelskaya Oblast. The first 20,000 tons of grain have been taken to granaries. Both wheat and rye have ripened much earlier than usual. (0600 GMT)

So far, 3 million tons of grain have reached procurement points in Krasnodarskiy Kray. (1000 GMT)

Permskaya Oblast has nearly completed winter crop sowing; rye has been sown on 90 percent of allocated area. Fertilizers are being applied at the time of sowing. Winter fallows have been plowed on 250,000 hectares in Kuybyshevskaya Oblast. This is 10 percent of the future spring crop area. Two-thirds of winter fallows are to be plowed in the Volga steppe by the end of August. (1800 GMT)

Mass harvesting of early grain crops has started in the Kokchetavskaya Oblast. Barley and oats are to be threshed from 600,000 hectares. (1950 GMT)

15 August

Mass sowing of winter rye has started in Gorkovskaya Oblast. The soil there has dried up during the summer. In all areas, seeds are being sown at a shallow depth. Winter crops will occupy over 500,000 hectares in the oblast. (0204 GMT)

To date 500,000 hectares of grain have been reaped in the Altayskiy Kray. Two-thirds of this total has been threshed. Harvesting of rye, winter wheat and peas has been completed. Machine operators are now concentrating on crops which were sown in the spring. (0400 GMT)

Silage and corn has been cleared from more than half the total area by farms in Tadzhikistan. After shredding, the green crops are taken from the fields to silage trenches. Specialized teams are harvesting corn in all areas. The average yield is 60-68 quintals per hectare. AFter harvesting, the fields are being sown with a second crop of corn and other fodder crops. (0600 GMT)

Field workers of Smolenskaya Oblast have begun sowing winter crops. This year winter crops will occupy 244,000 hectares in the oblast, almost twice as much as last year. Winter crops here give a resilient harvest regardless of the weather conditions. (0800 GMT)

Kurgenskaya Oblast is harvesting winter rye and peas, and has started selective harvesting of wheat. Grains have been cut on more than 100,000 hectares. Tselinogradskaya Oblast, Kazakhstan, has begun harvesting. Cutting of barley is being carried out. This crop occupies 560,000 hectares, one-fifth of the entire area under grain crops in the oblast. Hot weather in Tyumenskaya Oblast has meant that grain crops have ripened almost 2 weeks earlier than last year. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes are cutting winter rye, peas, barley and oats; threshing has also begun. All southern rayons have begun selling grain to the state. (1100 GMT)

Farmers in the Black Sea region today began the reaping and threshing of millet and buckwheat. These crops occupy around 25,000 hectares in that region, twice as much as last year. (1500 GMT)

16 August

Mass sowing of winter cereals has begun in the steppe land adjacent to the Urals. Townspeople are helping with fieldwork. As a result, the rate of grain harvesting and fodder procurement has been maintained at the usual level. (0001 GMT)

Potato digging has begun in southern Kirgizia. Growers in the mountainous region have promised to sell the state 85,000 tons of potatoes. (0400 GMT)

Mass harvesting of alfalfa is in progress in Uzbekistan. Perennial grasses have to be harvested from 40,000 hectares in the republic. (0600 GMT)

Sowing of winter grains has begun in Tambovskaya Oblast. One-half million hectares have been allocated to wheat and rye. This autumn, winter crops will cover more than 40 million hectares in the country. (0900 GMT)

The harvesting is ending in Kurskaya Oblast. To date, grain has been threshed from an area of over 1 million hectares, 93 percent of the total area. Harvesting of late grain crops as well as buckwheat and millet is taking place. In additions, fields are being prepared for winter sowing. (1200 GMT)

Harvesting of early grain crops has begun in all rayons of Novosibirskaya Oblast using the Ipatovo method. The area is over 2 million hectares. Mass harvesting has begun in Krasnoyarskiy Kray. Grain and pulses occupy 2.24 million hectares. (1500 GMT)

FODDER PROCUREMENT TOTALS FOR EARLY AUGUST

PM141405 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 7 Aug 81 p 1

[Agricultural review by livestock specialist M. Glinka: "Increasing the Rate of Fodder Procurement"]

[Excerpts] The USSR Central Statistical Administration reports that by 3 August the first mowing of sown and natural grasses had been completed on 63.7 million hectares, including 52.3 million hectares for hay and cured hay. Procurements of hay amounted to 48.2 million tons, or 72 percent of the plan.

Almost 46 million tons of cured hay and about 12 million tons of silage was procured. Production of artificially dehydrated green fodder amounted to 4.4 million tons. Straw was stacked and removed from 27.2 million hectares, which is 65 percent of the threshed area, and 24.7 million tons of this fodder was stored.

August--the last month of summer--is passing. And for many regions of the country this is the month of most active fodder procurement. There is still a great deal to be done. The plan for hay procurement has still only been fulfilled by 72 percent, even less cured hay (less by 17 percent) has been procured than last year, silage making is only just beginning and only 5 percent of the planned amount of succulent fodder has been stored.

And the reduction of the work rate on the fodder field is all the more astonishing. However complex the weather conditions were last summer, matters went more rapidly then. Let us compare the following facts: In the report week this year grass was mown on 5,313,000 hectares and in the same week last year--on 6,054,000 hectares. During this time the respective amounts procured were: 4,617,000 and 6,085,000 tons of hay; 2,978,000 and 4,814,000 tons of cured hay; and 2.83 million and 3.2 million tons of silage; and 450,000 and 518,000 tons of artificially dehydrated green fodder were produced.

Of course, it is difficult to check the state of affairs on farms where the deadlines for the hay mowing have not been taken into account. Nonetheless such an analysis is necessary--both as a lesson for the future and as a warning to those leaders and specialists who are making no haste with mounting the second most important fodder procurement work--silage making. So it is for instance, in the regions of the Transbaykal meteorologists are predicting frosts soon in east Siberia. And in Chitinskaya Oblast the grass is mown on only 30 percent of the area while in the Buryatskaya ASSR it is even less--16 percent. The procurement plan here has been fulfilled respectively by 19 and 8 percent for hay, by 10 and 20 percent for cured hay and by 16 and 18 percent for grass meal. This has happened because on many farms they have begun the hay mowing 1.5-2 weeks later. On the kolkhozes and sovkhozes of Chitinskaya Oblast by no means all hay mowing workers were active even at the end of July and out of 159 grass meal units only 96 were active. Indeed the equipment taken out onto the meadows was used extremely unproductively. By this time in a number of rayons of the Buryatskaya ASSR they have still hardly begun laying in cured hay but have thrown all their forces into procuring stalk fodder.

It is necessary, of course, to take account of the extremely complex weather conditions this year. In many regions of Siberia rain is preventing fodder from being procured. And the weather has become unstable in the country's European area too. But the main reason for the lag in most cases is still bad organization on the part of farm leaders, poor work organization and the low level of people's moral and material interest. The Yeniseyskiy and Pirovskiy Rayons of Krasnoyarskiy Kray are located very close, bordering each other. But though in the former the plan for laying in cured hay has been fulfilled by only 21 percent, in the latter it has been fulfilled by a full 104 percent. And as a whole through the kray only 36 percent of the target in this fodder has been stored so far.

Many farms completely unjustly despise procurement of this fodder. Making cured hay from grasses enables losses of nutrients to be noticeably reduced. The advantages of this fodder become obvious especially in periods of unstable weather: for considerably less time is required to dry-cure grasses than to fully dry them. And correct action has been taken in Irkutskaya Oblast in recommending farms to intensify the laying in of cured hay in this situation. The plan for its procurement has been fulfilled in the Angara region by 43 percent already--this is the best indicator in east Siberia.

Kolkhozes and sovkhozes of Karelia, in Stavropolskiy, Primorskiy and Khabarovskiy Krays and in Vologodskaya, Astrakhanskaya and Amurskaya Oblasts have completed the plan for laying in cured hay. In Dagestan and Kalmyria twice as much as the planned amount of cured hay has been stored. The Mariyskaya ASSR and Ryazanskaya, Penzenskaya and certain other oblasts are lagging in the procurement of this fodder.

It is about time for mass silage making in most regions of the country. They are getting this work rapidly under way in Vologodskaya Oblast, where they have already laid in 1,089,000 tons of green matter and obtained 443,000 tons of prepared silage (31 percent of the plan). Over one-third of succulent fodder is enriched with nitrogenous additives. In Primorskiy Kray the plan for laying in silage has been fulfilled by 43 percent and in the Kalmytskaya ASSR by 36 percent. It is being laid in at a fast rate in Leningradskaya, Kalininskaya, Yaroslavskaya and Sakhalinskaya Oblasts and the Checheno-Ingushskaya ASSR. Among the union republics, the farms of Estonia (45 percent), Turkmenia (28 percent) and Tadzhikistan (26 percent) have procured most silage.

Of course, in choosing the time for silage making we must be guided primarily by the state of the crops cultivated for these purposes. It is known that sunflowers grown for silage are best harvested during the milky ripeness stage and corn in the milky-waxy stage. However, in a number of places because of the intense heat the stores of productive moisture in the ground have been reduced to critical levels. In these conditions, scientists and specialists in Saratovskaya Oblast believe, the corn plants will rapidly dry out, which will lead to the loss of the good harvest already grown. Here they have resolved to begin the mass harvesting of silage crops so as to complete the laying in of corn silage in August. By 3 August they had laid in 500,000 tons of silage as against 320,000 tons by the same date last year in the oblast.

Corn is the main silage crop in most regions of the country. However, its cultivation is not treated everywhere in an economical way. And every omission in agrotechnics acutely reduces the yield. At the Tambovskaya Oblast agricultural experimental station they have obtained up to 350 quintals of corn green matter per hectare by applying a good dose of fertilizer and only 290 quintals without fertilizer on average over the last 5 years. What then must be the level of agrotechnics on kolkhozes and sovkhozes of the oblast, if last year, which was the most productive year of the 5-year period, only 155 quintals of the green matter was gathered there per hectare. This year many farms have still only gathered up to 50-60 quintals per hectare. But the time for silage making has already arrived.

The grain harvest releases yet another source of fodder. This is a matter of the straw, chaff and other leftovers from the threshing. They have organized its gathering well in Krasnodarskiy Kray, where straw has been procured from four-fifths of all threshed areas. On the farms of the Kuban special storehouses have been built to store chaff. On the field of Dagestan, Chuvashia and Tataria and of Belgorodskaya, Kurskaya, Lipetskaya and Penzenskaya Oblasts, straw has been cleared on over 70 percent of the area. They are lagging in this work in Volgogradskaya, Orenburgskaya and certain other oblasts.

Now is the most intense time in the country's field. Success will be achieved by those who know how to carry out all the urgent harvest work in a single operation.

PAVLOV REVIEWS HARVESTING OF GRAIN, FODDER

PM141420 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Aug 81 Morning Edition p 1

[O. Pavlov "Agricultural Review": "Harvesting Rapidly and Without Losses"]

[Text] As the USSR Central Statistical Administration reports, by Monday, 3 August, grain and pulse crops (excluding corn) had been cut over an area of 46.4 million hectares—39 percent.

Grain had been threshed over 42.1 million hectares, which is 90 percent of the area cut.

In the past week grain crops were cut over 11.6 million hectares and threshed over 13,4 million hectares. In 7 days RSFSR farms cut grain crops over 8.5 million hectares--this is the highest indicator so far in the republic during this year's harvest.

The Stavropolskiy Kray farmers have produced gratifying results. They have already sold the state more than 2 million tons of grain and overfulfilled socialist pledges, and are continuing to send grain to the elevators and reception centers. This is an example which merits wide dissemination. The Stavropolskiy Kray working people, making skillful use of the Ipatovskiy method, have reduced the time taken for the harvest although it took place in difficult conditions--with rain and with lodged crops. And--most important--here they adhered to a precise schedule for the shipment and transportation of grain.

TASS reports that on 4 August farms in the Kuban finished harvesting winter grain crops. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes in Ust-Labinskiy, Dinskiy, Korenovskiy, Pavlovskiy and certain other rayons harvested an average of 40-50 quintals of wheat and barley per hectare. It is important to note that during the harvest they ensured reliable safeguards against losses.

It is necessary energetically, efficiently and skillfully to combat losses of grain and other produce which are, unfortunately, still great at times. This is demanded by the 26th CPSU Congress decisions and by state interests. Much has been done in the southern granaries to avoid wastage of grain: Oblasts and rayon harvest quality services have operated and deputies' posts and people's controllers have been active. All the same shortcomings, as they say, have taken place. Thus the Ukrainian CP Central Committee plenum recently noted shortcomings in the organization of the harvest in Nikolayevskaya and certain other oblasts in the republic.

This criticism found its mark, and farms in central and western regions of the Ukraine are carrying out the harvest in a well-organized way and at a good pace. The republic's machine operators are now harvesting the last million hectares of early grain crops. On more than 90 percent of the fields cut the grain has been threshed.

In the RSFSR grain and pulse crops have been cut over 26.8 million hectares--37.1 percent--and this is nearly 5 million hectares more than by the same time last year. In the past week farms in Altayskiy and Krasnoyarksiy Krays and Kemerovskaya, Novosibirskaya and Kurganskaya Oblasts have embarked on the harvest.

Much more has been harvested in the Non-Chernozem Zone than last year. However, this is nothing for economic leaders to boast about. The years are completely different. Remember the heavy rain last August. And this year the grain has ripened approximately 2 weeks earlier. With the exception of a few recent days, ideal harvesting weather has prevailed in the Non-Chernozem Zone. On this basis the harvesting rates can hardly be called high.

Farms in Tulskaya Oblast have cut less than half the grain crops. Yet they were among the first in the region to begin harvesting. A considerable gap between cutting and threshing has been permitted in Orlovskaya Oblast, and now that it is raining from time to time this is affecting the pace. Farms in Smolenskaya, Ivanovskaya and Kalininskaya Oblast are slow to get under way. Judge for yourself: In the Moscow area grain has been cut over 63 percent of the area, yet in Kalininskaya Oblast, 167 km from Moscow, it has been cut over only 7 percent of the area.

It is quite clear that the leaders of a number of farms and rayon organizations were unable to get themselves organized for an early start to the harvest, delayed the preparation of machinery and failed to mobilize people. Now it is very important to sharply accelerate the rate of cutting and threshing. Every day lost means wasted yield. Moreover the time for the winter sowing is approaching. In Vologodskaya Oblast, for instance, the time has already come to sow winter rye, yet grain crops have only been cut over 5 percent of the area. Delays in the harvest in the Non-Chernozem Zone mean a shortfall not only in this year's harvest, but in next year's too.

Fodder procurement continues. Overall more fodder has now been laid in than last year. But this is no reason for complacency. Over a considerable territory unfavorable conditions have arisen for growing a second crop after the first cut. The possibilities for a repeat procurement of grasses are limited. Moreover a shortfall is being noted in silage crops and fodder root crops. That means that additional reserves must be sought.

People are acting correctly where they are careful with straw and chaff. An example is being set, in particular, by farms in the Ust-Labinskiy and Bryukhovetskiy Rayons of Krasnodarksiy Kray, where all the chaff is taken to special storehouses. In kolkhozes and sovkhozes in Krylovksiy Rayon in the same kray, all the hay has been gathered in 101 big ricks, which are all covered with polyethylene sheets. There can be no doubt that the quality of this hay will not deteriorate during storage.

People in the Moscow area are inventively seeking additional fodder preserves. One such reserve is the through harvesting of wild grasses. This is continuing now. Everything is used, even burdock and goosefoot. The population are involved in the harvest, including members of gardening clubs, pensioners and people on vacation. Material incentives operate. Thus the Bolshevik Kolkhoz in Domodedovskiy Rayon is paying the haymaker R15 for every ton of greenery.

In some places people used to be skeptical about the procurement of wild grasses. They would say that it was only goosefoot. But laboratory analysis has shown that a kilogram of granules prepared on grass meal, from goosefoot, contains 72 mg of carotene and 7.3 mg of digestible protein. A kilogram of such meal amounts ot 0.58 of a fodder unit. In other words, 580 grams of oats. True, it is not the best fodder but combined with other components in livestock diet it is quite effective.

The vegetable season has arrived. Moldavia and the Transcaucasian republics are continuing to dispatch them to union stocks.

August is a month of intensive fieldwork. It is also the month of the reception of large volumes of the produce grown. And it is very important to prevent looses, to deliver the produce to the consumer in good condition and to lay in what is necessary for safe storage.

BRIEFS

KAZAKH CORN HARVEST--The corn harvest is currently underway in the northern sectors of the Kazakh SSR. This year's harvest is expected to be much greater than those in previous years. [Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 12 Aug 81 GF]